

# THE CLASSICAL REVIEW

EDITED BY  
E. HARRISON AND C. J. FORDYCE

*BOARD OF MANAGEMENT:*

PROF. D. S. ROBERTSON, M.A. (*Chairman*).  
J. G. BARRINGTON-WARD, M.A. (*Hon. Treasurer*).  
E. A. BARBER, M.A., F.B.A. (*Hon. Secretary*).  
PROF. J. F. DOBSON, M.A.; PROF. H. A. ORMEROD, M.A., F.S.A.  
F. H. SANDBACH, M.A.; PROF. E. H. WARMINGTON, M.A.

With the co-operation of PROF. TENNEY FRANK, Johns Hopkins University, and  
PROF. E. K. RAND, Harvard University.

---

VOLUME LI.

---

PUBLISHED FOR THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION  
LONDON  
JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, W.  
NEW YORK  
G. E. STECHERT & CO., 31-33, EAST 10TH STREET  
1937

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

## No. 1.

	PAGE
Notes and news . . . . .	I
Version, E. H. . . . .	2
IIH'H and KPHNH. R. E. WYCHERLEY . . . . .	2
More Greek for 'Atheism'. J. TATE . . . . .	3
Thucydides i. 22. A. R. W. HARRISON . . . . .	6
Q. Mucius Scaevola the Pontifex and <i>Oratio</i> <i>Provinciae</i> . J. P. V. D. BALSDON . . . . .	8
'Cock' in Latin: A Postscript. G. P. SHIPP . . . . .	10
Two Phrygian Epitaphs: A Correction. W. M. CALDER . . . . .	10

### Reviews:

*Humanism and Technique in Greek Studies* (Dodds);  
*Greece and Rome*, iv-vi; *The Odyssey* (Amery),  
W. M. CALDER, 10; *Roots of the Tree* (Stanley),  
F. R. EARP, 12; *Anthologia Lyrica Graeca*, I  
(Diehl), C. M. BOWRA, 13; *Panhellenism in*  
*Aristophanes* (Hugill), A. W. GOMME, 14; *Aris-*  
*totelis De Caelo libri IV* (Allan), W. K. C.  
GUTHRIE, 15; *Plotinus Schriften übersetzt*, II,  
III (Harder), E. R. DODDS, 16; *Procopius*,  
VI (Dewing); *Plutarch's Moralia IV* (Babbitt),  
E. HARRISON, 17; *Untersuchungen zu Palladius*

(Svending), J. W. PIRIE, 19; *Ammianus Mar-*  
*cellinus*, I (Rolfé), G. B. A. FLETCHER, 20;  
*Sidonius*, I (Anderson), W. H. SEMPLÉ, 21;  
*History of Early Iran* (Cameron), J. L. MYRES,  
23; *The Erythraea Decree* (Highby), R. MEIGGS,  
24; *A History of the Greek World from 479 to*  
*323 B.C.* (Laistner), A. W. GOMME, 26; *Rome,*  
*Republic and Empire*, I (Household), A. F.  
GILES, 28; *Princeps*, I (Weber), C. G. STONE,  
29; *Marc Antony* (Lindsay), R. SYME, 30;  
*Criminal Trials and Criminal Legislation under*  
*Tiberius* (Rogers), M. P. CHARLESWORTH, 31;  
*The Imperial Cult under the Flavians* (Scott), R.  
SYME, 32; *Coins of the Roman Empire in the*  
*British Museum*, III (Mattingly), D. ATKINSON,  
33; *A Greek-English Lexicon*, part 9 (Liddell  
and Scott), E. HARRISON, 34; *Dated Greek Minus-*  
*cule MSS. V. ii, VI* (Lake), E. H. MINNS, 35; *A*  
*list of printed catalogues of Greek manuscripts in*  
*Italy* (Powell), T. W. ALLEN . . . . . 10-36

Short reviews, 37; Correspondence, 43; Sum-  
maries of periodicals, 44; Books received . . . 45

## No. 2.

Notes and news . . . . .	49
Euripides, <i>Electra</i> 1292-1307. R. P. WINNING- TON-INGRAM . . . . .	51
The appearance of Charon in the <i>Frogs</i> . A. L. M. CARY . . . . .	52
An interpretation of Propertius IV. 7. AGNES KIRSOPP LAKE . . . . .	53
Juvenal i. 81-89. E. HARRISON . . . . .	53
Notes on the <i>Mulomedicina Chironis</i> . OTTO SKUTSCH . . . . .	56
Two notes. J. F. LOCKWOOD . . . . .	57
Two notes on the <i>Bacchae</i> . W. W. C. DUNLOP . . . . .	57
The use of oil in weaving. H. MICHELL . . . . .	58

### Reviews:

*Homère: Hymnes* (Humbert), J. TATE, 58;  
*The Agamemnon of Aeschylus* (Campbell), E.  
FRAENKEL, 59; *Eschyle et la Trilogie* (Méautis),  
A. M. DALE, 64; *Sophokles* (von Blumen-  
thal), T. B. L. WEBSTER, 65; *Die Fragmente*  
*der Vorsokratiker*, II (Diels-Kranz), H. C. BAL-  
DRY, 66; *A Study in Plato* (Hardie), G. C. FIELD,  
67; *Epikurs Kritik der platonischen Elementenlehre*

(Schmid), W. HAMILTON, 67; *Lucian*, vol. v  
(Harmon), A. S. OWEN, 68; *Titus Flavius*  
*Klemens, Die Teppiche* (Overbeck), C. R. C.  
ALLBERRY, 69; *The Rendel Harris Papyri*  
(Powell), W. G. WADDELL, 70; *Greek Metaphor*  
(Stanford), J. A. K. THOMSON, 70; *Remains of*  
*Old Latin*, II (Warmington), C. J. FORDYCE,  
71; *Grieksche Originele en Latijnsche Navolgingen*  
(Kuiper), H. TREDENNICK, 72; *Études sur*  
*Quintilien*, I, II (Cousin), D. A. G. HINKS, 74;  
*The Cambridge Ancient History*, vol. xi, H. M. D.  
PARKER, 75; *Pompeii* (Carrington), I. A. RICH-  
MOND, 76; *Roman Britain and the English Settle-*  
*ments* (Collingwood and Myres), G. C. WHIT-  
TICK, 77; *Traité de Métrique Grecque* (Koster),  
A. M. DALE, 79; *A. E. Housman* (Gow), C. J.  
FORDYCE, 80; *Balliol and Edinburgh Composi-*  
*tions* (Pickard-Cambridge); *Versions* (Poynton);  
*Greek and Latin Compositions* (Smedley),  
R. G. AUSTIN, 81; *Some Class-Books*, J. T.  
CHRISTIE . . . . . 58-82

Short reviews, 83; Correspondence, 88; Sum-  
maries of periodicals, 88; Books received . . . 94

## No. 3.

	PAGE		PAGE
The End of the <i>Phoenissae</i> . H. O. MEREDITH . . .	97	Review:	
Puns in Herodotus. J. E. POWELL . . .	103	<i>Five Men: Character Studies from the Roman</i>	
Recent Work on the Roman Theatre. W. BEARE . . .	105	<i>Empire</i> (Charlesworth). R. SYME . . .	111

## No. 4.

Notes and news . . . . .	113	PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE, 131; <i>Griechentum und</i>	
Caesar's use of tense sequence in indirect		<i>Goethezeit</i> (Rehm), A. H. J. KNIGHT, 132;	
speech. M. ANDREWES . . . . .	114	<i>César, La Guerre Civile</i> (Fabre), E. J. WOOD,	
Odd points in the <i>Agamemnon</i> . A. Y. CAMPBELL . . .	116	133; <i>Cicéron, Correspondance</i> , tome III (Con-	
The manuscript S of Herodotus. J. E. POWELL . . .	118	stans), E. J. WOOD, 134; <i>Liuy</i> , vols. IX-XI	
Plato, <i>Meno</i> 99e. R. G. BURY . . . . .	119	(Sage), W. H. SEMPLER and J. M. MACKAY,	
Reviews:		135; <i>Virgile, Énéide</i> vii-xii (Durand and Belle-	
<i>The Agamemnon</i> of Aeschylus translated (Mac-		sort), F. H. SANDBACH, 136; <i>A. Gellii Noctium</i>	
<i>Neice</i> ; <i>The Bacchae</i> of Euripides translated		<i>Atticarum Liber I</i> (Hornsby), C. J. FORDYCE,	
(Evelyn), F. R. EARP, 119; <i>The Plays of</i>		137; <i>Pervigilium Veneris</i> (Clementi); <i>The Science</i>	
<i>Euripides</i> (Hadas and McLean), F. R. EARP,		<i>of Dining</i> (Way); <i>Othloni Libellus Proverbiorum</i>	
120; <i>Hérodote, Histoires, livre II</i> (Legrand),		(Korfmacher); <i>Guido de Columnis, Historia</i>	
G. C. WHITTICK, 121; <i>Die Stellung des Menon</i>		<i>Destructionis Troiae</i> (Griffin); <i>The Comedy of</i>	
<i>in der Platonischen Philosophie</i> (Buchmann), R.		<i>Acolastus</i> (Carver), S. GASELEE, 138; <i>Vermischte</i>	
HACKFORTH, 122; <i>Xénophon, Helléniques</i> , tome I		<i>Studien zur lateinischen Sprachkunde und Syntax</i>	
(Hatzfeld), E. C. MARCHANT, 123; <i>Aristotle,</i>		(Löfstedt), J. W. PIRIE, 140; <i>Kleine Beiträge</i>	
<i>Problems</i> , vol. I (Hett), E. S. FORSTER, 124;		<i>zur lateinischen Lautlehre</i> (Svennung), J. W.	
<i>The World of Hesiod</i> (Burn), A. W. GOMME,		PIRIE, 141; <i>Excavations at Minturnae</i> , I (John-	
125; <i>Amphipolis</i> (Papastavru), A. W. GOMME,		son), I. A. RICHMOND, 142; <i>Kaiser Constantin</i>	
127; <i>Arte e Civiltà della Sicilia antica</i> (Pace),		<i>und die christliche Kirche</i> (Schwartz), N. H.	
J. L. MYRES, 128; <i>Sylloge Nummorum Grae-</i>		BAYNES, 143; <i>Roman Glass from Karanis</i>	
<i>corum</i> , II. vii-viii (Robinson), G. MACDONALD,		(Harden), W. A. THORPE, 144; <i>Herbarius</i>	
129; <i>Die Kenntnisse des Altertums über das</i>		(Delatte), H. J. ROSE . . . . .	119-146
<i>Karpatenbecken</i> (Borzsák), J. L. MYRES, 130;		Short reviews, 147; Summaries of periodicals,	
<i>A Glossary of Greek Birds</i> (Thompson), A. W.		151; Books received . . . . .	157

## No. 5.

Notes and news . . . . .	161	WILKINSON, 180; <i>The Odes of Horace and</i>	
ΑΠΙΑΣ. D. S. ROBERTSON . . . . .	162	<i>Catullus and Tibullus in English Verse</i> (Way),	
Homeric equivalents of ΦΘΟΝΟΣ. J. L. MYRES . . .	163	E. S. FORSTER, 181; <i>Cumaean Gates</i> (Knight),	
The London manuscripts of Aristophanes. J. F.		C. BAILEY, 182; <i>The Historical and Geo-</i>	
LOCKWOOD . . . . .	164	<i>graphical Sources used by Silius Italicus</i> (Nicol),	
New words from Plautus. O. SKUTSCH . . . . .	166	D. J. CAMPBELL, 183; <i>Eine Denkschrift an</i>	
Claudian, <i>In Rufinum</i> ii 156-162. W. H. SEMPLER . .	167	<i>Caesar über den Staat</i> (Carlsson), M. CARY, 184;	
Demosthenes, <i>Ol. i. 21</i> . J. E. POWELL . . . . .	167	<i>Die Germania des Tacitus</i> (Much), J. G. C.	
Notes on the Jerusalem palimpsest of Euripides.		ANDERSON, 184; <i>Tacitus, The Annals</i> , iv-xvi	
J. A. SPRANGER . . . . .	168	(Jackson), J. G. C. ANDERSON, 186; <i>C. Plini</i>	
THATTETOZ. W. B. STANFORD . . . . .	168	<i>Secundi Naturalis Historiae Liber Secundus</i>	
Lucan ii 503 f. W. M. EDWARDS . . . . .	169	(Campbell), C. J. FORDYCE, 187; <i>Cassiodori</i>	
Reviews:		<i>Senatoris Institutiones</i> (Mynors), S. GASELEE,	
<i>Untersuchungen zum 'Desmotes' des Aischylos</i>		188; <i>Lehrbuch der Geschichte der römischen</i>	
(Moeller); <i>Die Trilogie des Aischylos</i> (Stoessl),		<i>Literatur</i> (Bickel), J. WIGHT DUFF, 189; <i>Capital</i>	
A. M. DALE, 169; <i>Four Dramas of Euripides</i>		<i>Punishment in Athens</i> (Barkan), A. W. GOMME,	
<i>translated</i> (Meredith); <i>Euripides' Ion translated</i>		190; <i>Delphes au II<sup>e</sup> et au I<sup>er</sup> Siècle</i> (Daux),	
(H. D.), F. R. EARP, 171; <i>Herodot</i> (Pohlenz),		W. W. TARN, 191; <i>The Foundations of Roman</i>	
A. R. W. HARRISON, 172; <i>Das Problem der</i>		<i>Italy</i> (Whatmough), H. J. ROSE, 192; <i>Ritual</i>	
<i>Geschichtsschreibung des Thukydides</i> (Patzler), J. E.		<i>and Cults of Pre-Roman Iguvium</i> (Rosenzweig),	
POWELL, 173; <i>Paratactische compositio in de</i>		J. WHATMOUGH, 193; <i>Augustus Caesar</i> (Allen),	
<i>oudste Griekse literatuur</i> (van Groningen), J.		<i>Marcus Agrippa</i> (Wright), R. SYME, 194; <i>Kaiser</i>	
TATE, 174; <i>The Axiochus</i> (Blakeney), J. TATE,		<i>Vespasian</i> (Graß), R. SYME, 195; <i>Antoninus Pius</i>	
175; <i>Demosthenes, Private Orations</i> (Murray),		(Hüttl), M. CARY, 196; <i>The Story of the Ancient</i>	
D. S. ROBERTSON, 176; <i>Démotènes et la fin</i>		<i>World</i> (Clement), H. MATTINGLY, 197; <i>From</i>	
<i>de la démocratie athénienne</i> (Cloché), M. CARY,		<i>Ur to Rome</i> (Gadd), H. MATTINGLY, 198; <i>The</i>	
177; <i>Die Oikeiosis-Lehre Theophrasts</i> (Dirlemaier),		<i>Roman's World</i> (Moore), A. F. GILES, 198;	
D. J. ALLAN, 178; <i>Beobachtungen über Vers und</i>		<i>Attic Black-Figured Lekythoi</i> (Haspels), T. B. L.	
<i>Gedankengang bei Lukrez</i> (Büchner); <i>Introduction</i>		WEBSTER . . . . .	169-199
<i>to Lucretius</i> (Sinker), C. BAILEY, 179; <i>Horace,</i>		Short reviews, 200; Summaries of periodicals,	
<i>Three Phases of his Influence</i> (Saintonge), L. P.		204; Books received . . . . .	207

## No. 6.

	PAGE
Notes and news . . . . .	209
'Chance' in the Latin vocabulary. G. P. SHIPP . . . . .	209
<i>Cretae Oaxem</i> . W. F. J. KNIGHT . . . . .	212
Quintilian VI. iii. 47 and the <i>Fabula Atellana</i> . W. BEARE . . . . .	213
<i>Odyssey</i> ix 47 ff. E. HARRISON . . . . .	215
Dion. Hal. <i>De Dinarcho</i> c. 7. S. F. BONNER . . . . .	215

## Reviews:

*Der homerische Apollonhymnus* (Drerup), J. TATE, 216; *Controverses autour de Troie* (Vellay), H. L. LORIMER, 216; *Aglaia* (Lavagnini), J. A. DAVISON, 218; *Plato's Cosmology* (Cornford), A. E. TAYLOR, 219; *Aristotle, Problems xxii-xxxviii and Rhetorica ad Alexandrum* (Hett and Rackham), E. S. FORSTER, 221; *Some Greek Poems of Love and Beauty* (Edmonds); *Last Flowers* (Chamberlin), E. S. FORSTER, 222; *Vrouwenfiguren in de Werken van Menander* (Duparc), A. W. GOMME, 223; *Plutarch's Life of Aratus* (Porter); *Plutarchi Vita Arati* (Koster), F. W. WALBANK, 223; *Plotinus Schriften übersetzt*, V (Harder), J. H. SLEEMAN, 225; *Die Gebetsparodie in der Antike* (Kleinnecht), W. G. WADDELL, 226; *La filologia*

*latina dalle origini a Varrone* (Della Corte), J. WIGHT DUFF, 227; *Lineamenti di Storia della Letteratura Latina; Mantissa, Letture Latine* (Terzaghi), H. J. ROSE, 228; *Orazio nella letteratura mondiale*, L. P. WILKINSON, 229; *An Analytical Study of Horace's Ideas* (Nybakken), L. P. WILKINSON, 230; *The Aristaeus Episode of Vergil's Fourth Georgic* (Opheim), W. B. ANDERSON, 231; *M. Fabi Quintiliani Institutio Oratoria*, pars ii (Radermacher), G. B. A. FLETCHER, 232; *Petronio nel suo tempo* (Marmorale), S. GASELEE, 232; *Etudes de symbolisme funéraire* (de Ruyt); *Aspetti della morte nelle iscrizioni sepolcrali dell' impero romano* (Brelich), H. J. ROSE, 233; *Essays in Greek History and Literature* (Gomme), A. F. GILES, 234; *Miltiades* (Berve), A. W. GOMME, 235; *Corinth*, III. ii. (Carpenter, Bon, Parsons), A. J. B. WACE, 236; *Appians Darstellung des Zweiten Punischen Krieges* (Klotz), A. H. McDONALD, 237; *Principles of Roman Law* (Schulz), P. W. DUFF . . . . . 216-238

Short reviews, 239; Summaries of periodicals, 244; Books received, 246; Indexes . . . . . 247



# The Classical Review

FEBRUARY, 1987

## NOTES AND NEWS

THE Classical Association held a one-day meeting in London on January 8th at Westfield College. The meeting was most successful and very well attended. In the morning Mr. G. W. Dyson in a paper on 'Venantius Fortunatus' touched on many aspects of life and letters in the sixth century. Professor Bernard Ashmole gave a lantern lecture on 'The Monster in Greek Art' and demonstrated the varying skill with which the Greek sculptors and vase-painters tackled the problem of making a credible anatomical structure out of such hybrid forms as (e.g.) the centaur, cock-horse, satyr, siren and gorgon. During the afternoon the members discussed 'Platonism and Dictatorship'. Owing to the unavoidable absence through illness of Mr. R. H. S. Crossman, the discussion was opened by Mr. G. W. Dyson, who nobly stepped into the breach at the eleventh hour. In the interval between tea and dinner the members listened entranced to an informal talk from Professor E. Fraenkel on 'The Fairyland of Aristophanes' *Birds*'. Professor Fraenkel shed a fresh light on Aristophanes both as poet and as playwright, and delighted his audience by his reading of some of the lyrics. The proceedings were concluded by an Informal Dinner in the Dining Hall of Westfield College, at which the chair was taken by Professor J. F. Dobson, who moved a hearty vote of thanks to the authorities of the College for their kindness in putting the buildings at the disposal of the Association and providing in every possible way for the comfort of the members.

After a break of six years the Classical Association of Scotland has resumed the publication of its *Proceedings*. The new volume covers the years 1931-5 and contains five papers read to the Association—two, by Dr. C. H. Milne and Dr. W. A. Edward, on the

teaching of Latin grammar (both have a sad story to tell of its decline); discussions of English prosody in relation to classical forms, by Mr. J. D. McPetrie, and of ancient and modern Satire, by Mr. H. M. Bell; and Professor D'Arcy Thompson's presidential address on 'Astronomy in the Classics'.

We welcome the recent anastatic reprint of Einar Löfstedt's *Philologischer Kommentar zur Peregrinatio Aetheriae* (see C.R. L 159), a work which is of first-class importance not merely to students of Late Latin but to those of Classical and Early Latin as well. Since its original publication in 1911, work on the *Peregrinatio* includes the second edition of Heraeus's text in the *Sammlung Vulgärlateinischer Texte* and van Oorde's *Lexicon Aetherianum* (1930): but the *Kommentar* remains indispensable. It is remarkable not only for the acumen with which the history of linguistic phenomena is followed from the early period of Latin right down to Romance, but also for the rich indication it gives of subjects still awaiting investigation. The researches of A. H. Saloniuss, Franz Blatt, and many others in various parts of the Late Latin field owe much to Löfstedt's inspiration.

Readers of Livy who have painfully learnt the defects of Lewis and Short may be glad of a little more than was said in C.R. L 210 about the *Thesaurus* of Livy which Professor W. C. Summers is preparing for the Cambridge University Press. It will amount to about three hundred pages of Merguet's *Handlexikon* to Cicero. Every word used by Livy will be included, with all its meanings and constructions; and the numbers of occurrences will be recorded. English renderings will be given where they are required.

We are asked to announce that Dr.

J. W. Fuchs, of The Hague, is collecting materials for a lexicon to Livy which is to contain every instance of each word that Livy employs. The form in which he proposes to present his matter may

be seen in his recent index to Cicero *De Inventione*; and he will be grateful for any advice or criticism that users of that index, or students of Livy, may send to him at 's-Gravenhage, Billitonstraat 11.

Nulli se dicit mulier mea nubere malle  
quam mihi, non si se Iuppiter ipse petat.  
Dicit: sed mulier cupido quod dicit amanti,  
in uento et rapida scribere oportet aqua.

CATULLUS (LXX).

Οὐδενὶ μᾶλλον ἐμοῦ φησιν Ῥοδόκλεια γαμῆσθαι,  
οὐδ' εἰ μνηστεύοι θεῶν τε βροτῶν τε πατήρ.  
Φησὶν γ'· ἄλλ' ἂ γυνὴ ταχυπειθεὶ φησὶν ἑραστῇ,  
ταῦτ' ἀνέμων ῥιπαῖς ἔγγραφε καὶ ποταμῶν.

E. H.

### ΠΗΓΗ AND ΚΡΗΝΗ.

THE relation between the words *πηγή* and *κρήνη*, in some contexts very important, has not as far as I know been made quite clear, though one or two editors have illuminating notes on the point.<sup>1</sup> The treatment of the words in Liddell and Scott confuses the distinction and is incorrect in some details.

Each word has a certain meaning peculiar to it, and the essential distinction which this indicates is sometimes, though by no means generally, more carefully made. For the source of a considerable river *πηγή* is always used, usually in the plural. The word is not very frequent in Homer and is confined to this use; for example, *Iliad* 22. 147:—

ἐνθα δὲ πηγαὶ  
δοιαὶ ἀναΐσσοιτο Σκαμάνδρου διήεντος.

Again in *Iliad* 21. 312 Scamander tells Simois to fill his *ῥέεθρα* from his *πηγαί*. Liddell and Scott are inaccurate in saying that *πηγή* is 'used by Homer always in pl., streams' and differentiating this from the meaning '*fount, source*'.

The sense appropriated to *κρήνη* (L. and S., vaguely, '*well, spring, fountain*' . . . : poet. in pl., for *water*') is indicated by the title of the Athenian officials *κρηνῶν ἐπιμελῆται*—the fact that the springs are objects of *ἐπιμέλεια* makes

them *κρήναι* rather than mere *πηγαί*. *κρήναι* often occur in lists of common features of a city; for instance in Aristophanes, *Frogs* 112, 113:—

... φράσον μοι, λιμένας, ἀρτοποιία,  
πορνεί', ἀναπαύλας, ἑκτροπὰς, κρήνας, ὁδοὺς.<sup>2</sup>

For the more careful differentiation of the words certain passages in Thucydides are important. In II. 48. 2 he says of the Piraeus, *κρήναι γὰρ οὐπω ἦσαν αὐτόθι*. *οὐπω* implies that *κρήναι*, as distinct from simple natural springs, could be made and *were* made.<sup>3</sup> In II. 15. 5 Thucydides says, *τῇ κρήνῃ τῇ νῦν μὲν τῶν τυράννων οὕτω σκευασάντων Ἐννεακρόνῳ καλουμένην, τὸ δὲ πάλαι φανερῶν τῶν πηγῶν οὐσῶν Καλλιρρόῃ ὀνομασμένην*. So apparently the *πηγαί* are the natural outlets of water from the earth; the existence of facilities for its use produces a *κρήνη*. This is the distinction made also by another unusually precise author, Pausanias, who is treated separately below.

In many authors, however, particularly the poets, *κρήνη* sometimes seems to mean simply a natural spring, without definitely involving the idea of

<sup>2</sup> Also in Plato, *Laws* 758e; Demosthenes, 3. 29 and 13. 30; and Aristides I. 225.

<sup>3</sup> This was actually done, probably not long after the time to which Thucydides refers; see Judeich, *Topographie von Athen*, pp. 81, 203, 432.

<sup>1</sup> Macan on Herodotus IX. 51, and Hitzig and Blümner on Pausanias I. 14. 1.

artificiality. Homer says in *Odyssey* 9. 140:—

ῥέει ἀγλαὸν ὕδωρ,  
κρήνη ὑπὸ σπείρου· περὶ δ' αἰγέροι πεφύασι.

In fact he sees fit to add the adjective *τυκτὴ* in *Odyssey* 17. 205:—

ἐπὶ κρήνῃ ἀφίκοντο  
τυκτὴν καλλίρου, δθεν ὑδρεύοντο πολῖται.

So too Sophocles makes Ajax when praying (862) couple *κρῆναι* with *ποταμοί* and other natural features. With this one might compare Plato, *Phaedo* 112c: τὸ ὕδωρ . . . θαλάττας τε καὶ λίμνας καὶ ποταμούς καὶ κρήνας ποιεῖ.<sup>1</sup>

Pausanias naturally provides the most plentiful and valuable data. He uses *πηγή* (or *πηγαί*) of the source of a great river, as do all other authors (II. 25. 3, IV. 31. 4, V. 7. 1, etc.); and in general of any place where water emerges, as an ordinary spring, in a deep shaft (*φρέαρ*, X. 36. 9), from the roof of a cave (II. 7. 4), for the second time—the source of the Ladon is the outlet of water which flows through a chasm from the lake of Pheneus (VIII. 20. 1, 21. 1). *κρήνη*, on the other hand, is a place where spring water is made available for use; not necessarily by

an elaborate architectural arrangement, though this was so at Megara (I. 40. 1), where Theagenes built for the citizens a fountain *μεγέθους ἔνεκα καὶ κόσμου καὶ ἐς τὸ πλῆθος τῶν κινόντων θέας ἀξίαν*· καὶ ὕδωρ ἐς αὐτὴν ῥεῖ καλούμενον Σιθνίδων νυμφῶν. This last remark raises another point. Pausanias sometimes distinguishes *πηγή* and *κρήνη* as parts of a whole—*πηγή* the outlet from the earth, *κρήνη* the basin or other arrangement into which the water flows. The water of Pirene flows into a *κρήνη ὑπαιθρος*.<sup>2</sup> Sometimes the *κρήνη* actually has a different name from the source. The *κρήνη* Arsinoe at Messene was fed from a *πηγή* called Clepsydra (IV. 31. 6).<sup>3</sup> Thus Pausanias recognizes the same distinctions as Thucydides. But since even an elaborately arranged fountain has a simple source tucked away somewhere and this is the essential part of it, even an Enneacrunos (I. 14. 1) or a Pirene can be called in a general way *πηγή* without culpable looseness of expression.

R. E. WYCHERLEY.

University of Manchester.

<sup>1</sup> For other examples see Euripides, *Bacchae* 706; Plato, *Critias* 111D.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. X. 12. 6.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. II. 35. 3 on the *κρῆναι* of Hermion.

## MORE GREEK FOR 'ATHEISM.'

COMMENTS which I have received on *Greek for 'Atheism'* (C.R. L, 3) suggest that scholars would welcome further proof that *νομίζειν θεούς* means *νομίζειν θεούς εἶναι*.<sup>1</sup> The following notes deal with eight passages, of which all save the third and the eighth have already been used by others in discussing the indictment of Socrates.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Plato (notably in *Apol.* and *Laus*) and Xenophon (*Mem.* I 1, §§ 2, 5) use the two expressions as synonymous. I waive here the questions whether they (a) were mistaken, (b) misled us (pointlessly), (c) conspired (in a very complicated manner) to do so.

<sup>2</sup> For the statistics given I admit full responsibility, though I have made some use of Todd's index to Aristophanes and von Essen's to Thucydides. I have had to decide silently a few cases (none of importance) where there is room for disagreement. [*E.g.*, Sophocles fr. 86 (Nauck)—not in point here—seems to me T,

For the sake of brevity I group the meanings of *νομίζειν* as C ('use,' 'have,' or 'adopt, as customary' or 'lawful') and T ('think'), adding A (active) and P (passive). An infinitive of indirect speech I call an 'oblique infinitive.' When I speak of an oblique infinitive as 'understood,' I do not necessarily mean that its absence is actually felt by the reader as a positive omission.

(1) Herodotus IV 59, *τούτους* (sc., with Burnet on *Apol.* 24c 1, *τοὺς θεούς*) *νενομίκασι*. That *νενομίκασι* means 'think' (L. and S.), and that *εἶναι* is understood, would appear from the parallels: III 8, *Διόνυσον δὲ θεῶν μόνον καὶ τὴν Οὐρανίην ἡγήοντα εἶναι*, and IV

but C to L. and S.] But I should be glad to supply my full references to any scholar who may wish to use or criticize my results.

94, οὐδένα ἄλλον θεὸν νομίζοντες εἶναι.<sup>1</sup> L. and S. supply θεούς, and regard this and other passages as exemplifying the omission of ὡς. For the insertion of ὡς they cite II 1 as ὡς δούλους, whereas Herodotus there wrote ὡς δούλους εἶντας.<sup>2</sup> There is no instance of νομίζειν ὡς with an attributive word, and there is no other instance of νομίζειν ὡς with a participle, in the authors here examined. But there are—see remarks on my passage (5) and notes 6 and 9—plenty of instances of ν. (TA) with oblique εἶναι (38 in Herodotus) and of the omission of this εἶναι. Whether expressed or understood, this εἶναι is usually the mere copula; but in passage (1) and the two parallels adduced it is clearly existential.

(2) *Ibid.* V 97, ἀσπίδα νομίζουσι (cf. VII 85, ὅπλα νομίζουσι ἔχειν, et al.) with eight other possible examples of CA with the accusative of a noun. These mean 'to practise,' 'use' (a rite, justice, a language, a weapon, a name), never 'worship,' 'honour' or 'recognize'; and give no help with νομίζειν θεούς, which, except for (1), does not occur in Herodotus.

(3) *Ibid.* II 50, νομίζουσι οὐδ' ἥρωσι οὐδέν. This comes nearest to 'worship'; for I do not think ἥρωσι instrumental (*pace* *editorum*), but resembling IV 59, τοῦτω δὲ νομίζουσι (where θυσίας ποιεῖν is understood), and not parallel to IV 63, ὑσί ('make no use of') or IV 117, φωνῇ. But even if I am right in rendering 'they have no institution in honour of heroes,' no light is shed on νομίζειν θεούς.

(4) [Lysias] VI 19, ἐπεδείξατο ὅτι θεοὺς οὐ νομίζει. By taking up ναυκληρία he proved what? That he did not 'worship' ('fear') the gods? Rather

he showed that he did not believe there were gods to punish his impiety. 'Sc. εἶναι' seems the right explanation.

(5) *Ibid.* 51, θεῶν οὐς ἡμεῖς θεοὺς νομίζομεν. Supply εἶναι (copula). The sense could scarcely be 'worship,' which is very fully expressed in the next words; but I do not stress this point, in deference to Burnet on *Euthyphr.* 3b 3. I stress rather the facts that (a) I find no such sense either in the thirty-five speeches ascribed to Lysias or elsewhere, (b) in these speeches νομίζειν (TA) has oblique εἶναι 22 times, while in 15 other cases if anything is omitted it is εἶναι (not—*pace* L. and S.—ὡς), as is clear from a comparison of (e.g.) XII 47 (ὄρκους πιστοὺς ἐνόμιζον) with XII 51 (πόλιν ἐχθρὰν ἐνόμιζεν εἶναι).<sup>3</sup>

(6) Lysias XII 9, οὔτε θεοὺς οὔτε ἀνθρώπους νομίζει. The suggested meaning 'worship' does not suit ἀνθρώπους; and to substitute 'fear' (in two senses) sounds better, but fails to get rid of the zeugma. The usage of Lysias is overwhelmingly in favour of νομίζειν (A) meaning 'think.' Hence it would seem that εἶναι is understood, and the phrase, literally rendered, means 'he did not believe in the existence of gods or men.' The statistics, combined with (4), appear so to rule the case. Admittedly the literal rendering seems absurd in English; but in Greek the exaggeration reads naturally and easily. Owing to the Greek fondness for contrasting words (especially in stereotyped phrases), both poles of an antithesis are not infrequently expressed when only one is relevant; as when Creon calls for his servants, 'both those who are, and those who are not, there' (Sophocles *Ant.* 1109).

(7) Aristophanes *N.* 819, τὸ Δία νομίζειν ὄντα τηλικουτονί. What is ridiculed here is the belief in the exist-

<sup>1</sup> I find in Herodotus 123 certain instances of ν.=62 TA (=54 with an oblique inf. expressed +3 where oblique εἶναι is understood +5 others)+19 TP (=10 with εἶναι expressed +8 with εἶναι understood +1 abs.)+28 CA (=12 with a dependent inf. expressed +1 with a dependent inf. understood +9 with the accusative of a noun +3 with the accusative of a pronoun +3 with the dative of a noun)+14 CP. I am indebted to Mr. J. Enoch Powell for a small correction.

<sup>2</sup> They also cite Plato *Laws* 879c, where I should suppose that εἶναι is understood; but in any case it is clearly outweighed by my figures for earlier authors.

<sup>3</sup> In 'Lysias' I count 91 ν.=78 certain TA [=61 with an oblique inf. expressed (22 times this inf. is εἶναι)+15 where oblique εἶναι is understood +2 others]+8 TP+2 CP + the 3 instances discussed above (all of which I should class as TA with oblique εἶναι understood). It certainly looks as if in Lysias [as in Antiphon (10 ν.=4 TA+6 CP) and Andocides (27 ν.=27 T)] the active voice of νομίζειν always means 'think'; I suspect that this is true of all genuinely Attic prose.

ence of Zeus (827, οὐκ ἔστιν, ὃ Φεῖδ-  
 ἠπίδῃ, Ζεὺς); and Hackforth seems  
 justified in regarding the line as signifi-  
 cant for the sense of νομίζειν θεούς. A  
 useful parallel is *Eq.* 32, ἐπεὶ ἡγή γὰρ  
 θεούς; where an existential εἶναι is  
 clearly understood. For the ease with  
 which εἶναι may be omitted without  
 changing the sense of νομίζειν see, e.g.,  
*Av.* 496, νομίσας ὄρθρον, and *Pl.* 682.<sup>1</sup>

(8) Euripides *Suppl.* 732, θεοὺς νομίζω,  
 'I believe in the existence of the gods.'  
 This sense (which implies an under-  
 stood εἶναι) is demanded by the con-  
 text; the editors compare *Od.* 24, 351.  
 In support of the construction, note  
 (a) that νοεῖν is used in exactly the same  
 way in fr. 913, τίς τὰδε λεύσσω θεὸν  
 οὐχὶ νοεῖ; where astronomical atheism  
 is condemned. (This use of νοεῖν is  
 not in L. and S.) (b) So too is ἡγείσθαι  
 in ἡγείσθαι θεούς (*El.* 583, *Hec.* 800,  
*Bac.* 1326) and τὰ θεῶν ἡγονομένη (*Hel.*  
 919).<sup>2</sup> (c) For the insertion of this  
 εἶναι see, e.g., Critias fr. 1, 42, νομίζειν  
 δαιμόνων εἶναι γένος. (d) There are  
 only two examples of νομίζειν (CA) with  
 the accusative of a noun in Euripides  
 (τέχνην, νόμον); these do not support  
 the sense 'worship', and are not parallel  
 to νομίζειν θεούς. But perhaps we  
 should be grateful to Cicero for trans-  
 lating fr. 941, τοῦτον νόμιζε ('habeto')  
 Ζῆνα, τόνδ' ἡγοῦ θεόν.<sup>3</sup> Otherwise there

might have been novel renderings of  
 this verse and of (e.g.) *Cycl.* 355, 521,  
*Med.* 170.<sup>4</sup>

Besides T and C, a sense 'esteem',  
 'hold in honour', is offered by L. and S.  
 with three examples: (a) Pindar, *Isthm.*  
 5, 2, quoted as νομίζειν χρυσὸν περιώσιον  
 ἄλλων, the important word μεγασθενή  
 being, perhaps by accident, ignored.  
 This implies the translation 'honoured  
 powerful gold above all else.' But in  
 view of the numerous instances of TA  
 with oblique εἶναι understood (*supra*;  
 see also Aeschylus *Pers.* 169, 498),  
 Farnell is surely right: 'deemed gold a  
 thing of power' etc. (b) is (6) *supra*, a  
 more than doubtful instance. (c) For  
 the passive, Plato *Gorg.* 466b. This is  
 misleading. Asked if he thinks that  
 good orators are reckoned as worthless  
 (φαῦλοι νομίζεσθαι),<sup>5</sup> Socrates replies

<sup>1</sup> In Euripides (ignoring *fr. dub. et spur.*) I  
 find 73 v. = 43 TA + 17 TP + 4 CA (of which  
 2 have a dependent inf. and 2 the accusative of  
 a noun) + 9 CP. Of the 43 TA, there are 20  
 instances with an oblique inf. expressed (in 2 of  
 these the inf. is εἶναι), 22 where an oblique εἶναι  
 is understood, and 2 others. The addition is  
 correct, since I have counted *Heraclid.* 1039  
 twice for the same reason as Aristoph. *N.* 1049  
 was counted twice in n. 6 *supra*. That εἶναι is  
 understood in the 22 cases of TA mentioned  
*supra* is proved by this line, and also by com-  
 paring (e.g.) *Med.* 527, Κύπριν ν. σότειραν εἶναι  
 with *Heraclides* 484, Ἀἰδὴν ν. πενθερόν.

I add the statistics for Thucydides. Certain  
 occurrences of v. = 279 = 264 TA + 6 TP + 4 CA  
 (of which 3 govern a dative and 1 has a de-  
 pendent inf.) + 5 CP. Of the 264 TA, there are  
 210 instances with an oblique inf. expressed (in  
 66 of these an oblique εἶναι expressed is in-  
 volved), 48 where an oblique εἶναι is understood,  
 and 6 others. That oblique εἶναι is understood  
 in the 48 cases mentioned follows from (a) the  
 fact that an oblique εἶναι is clearly understood  
 in phrases of the type of VIII 56, 4, ἄπορα ν.  
 καὶ ἐξηπατήσθαι (cf. Aristoph. *N.* 1049, n. 6  
*supra*), (b) from a comparison of (e.g.) II 21, 3,  
 Περικλέα αἰτιον ν. with IV 82, ν. Περδικέα αἰτιον  
 εἶναι. Note (a) that there is no warrant in  
 Thucydides for the Herodotean usage of νομίζειν  
 (CA) with the accusative of a noun; (b) that  
 there are plenty of instances which illustrate the  
 ease with which an oblique εἶναι can be omitted  
 with νομίζειν (TA), e.g., V 98, ἐν δ' ἐκείνῳ οὐ  
 νομίζετε ἀσφάλειαν; (which is as close a parallel  
 to νομίζειν θεοὺς—εἶναι being understood—as  
 one might reasonably expect to find).

<sup>2</sup> I count this as an example of TP with εἶναι  
 understood. Of this type there are 5 instances  
 in Thuc., 17 in Eurip., 7 in 'Lysias', 3 in  
 Aristoph., and 8 in Herod. Although this εἶναι  
 is usually omitted, there is justification for saying

<sup>1</sup> In Aristoph. I count 56 v. = 43 TA + 4 TP +  
 1 CA (with a dependent inf., *V.* 1196) + 8 CP.  
 Of the 43 TA, 19 have an oblique inf. expressed  
 (8 times this inf. is εἶναι), and 25 imply an  
 oblique εἶναι understood. That makes 44; but  
 I have counted *N.* 1049 twice, ἄνδρ' ἀριστον  
 νομίζειν καὶ ποιεῖν, since ποιεῖν is an in-  
 stance of expressed oblique inf., and καὶ proves  
 that εἶναι (not ὅς, by the way) is understood  
 with ἄνδρ' ἀριστον. More proof that εἶναι is  
 understood in such sentences is afforded by com-  
 paring (e.g.) *R.* 776, ν. σοφώτατον with *Pl.* 776,  
 εἶναι ν. χρήσιμον (where εἶναι could have been  
 omitted without change of sense).

Compare the figures for ἡγείσθαι in Aristoph.  
 Of 29 occurrences 9 mean 'lead' and 20 'think'.  
 Of these 20, 5 have an oblique εἶναι expressed,  
 and the remaining 15 imply an oblique εἶναι  
 understood.

<sup>2</sup> *Hel.* 919 is of value (I think) for τὰ θεῖα μὴ ν.  
 of Diopithes' decree. Belief in the validity of  
 religion, the reality of the gods and their ordin-  
 ances, is the point.

<sup>3</sup> A good instance of νομίζειν and ἡγείσθαι  
 synonymous, suggesting that, for the sense  
 'think,' they should have received parallel treat-  
 ment in L. and S.



that they are not even reckoned (*οὐδὲ νομίζεσθαι*). Obviously *οὐδὲ ν.* means something even less dignified than *φαῦλοι ν.* Therefore *νομίζεσθαι* cannot mean 'to be esteemed' in the sense 'to be held in honour.' L. and S. used to refer to Heindorf (*ad loc.*) for instances of this sense; but his instances fall under other heads, as L. and S. now (it would seem) admit by citing none of them here and one of them (Aristophanes *N.* 962) under 'use customarily.'<sup>1</sup>

I conclude that there are no instances of *νομίζειν* 'worship,' 'fear' or 'honour,' and none of *νομίζειν θεούς* 'practise or use gods' (whatever that would mean). Quite apart from the evidence of Plato and Xenophon, (1), (4), (7) and (8), with the parallels supplied by *ἡγείσθαι*, and the statistics of the usages of

that it is really implied. Herodotus inserts or omits it with equal readiness; of TP with an expressed *εἶναι* he exhibits 10 examples, whereas 'Lysias' and Aristoph. have only 1 each, and Thuc. and Eurip. none.

<sup>1</sup> Better 'instances' than any of the above might have been alleged, e.g., Eurip. *Herac.* 201, ἡ γὰρ αἰσχύνῃ πάρος τοῦ ζῆν νομίζεσθαι. But this is, of course, an instance of TP with *εἶναι* understood.

*νομίζειν*, should place beyond all doubt the correctness of the view that *νομίζειν θεούς* is synonymous with *νομίζειν θεοὺς εἶναι*.

Since there is no evidence or probability that public worship was compulsory at Athens, and since Socrates was punctilious in performing his public religious duties, it is clear that the impiety alleged in the words of the indictment *οὐς ἡ πόλις νομίζει θεοὺς οὐ νομίζων* must have consisted in disbelief in the existence of the gods of the state, i.e., in crypto-heresy, which would be inferred by his accusers from (among other things) his critical language regarding venerable myths or rites connected with myths. That such critical language came under the Attic law of impiety is evident from the case of Diagoras of Melos, whose offence consisted of words, not deeds.<sup>2</sup>

J. TATE.

University of St. Andrews.

<sup>2</sup> [Lysias] VI 17; cf. XXX 17, ἀσεβείν λεγόντα. The point is more fully developed in my article 'Plato, Socrates and the Myths,' *C.Q.* XXX (1936), p. 142.

## THUCYDIDES 1, 22.

THERE are some points in Mr J. E. Powell's review of Grosskinsky's *Das Programm des Thukydides* in *C.R.* L p. 174 which seem to call for comment.

(1) The only real novelty which Mr Powell allows to G. is his interpretation of *τῶν μελλόντων ποτὲ αὖθις κτλ* as being future for Thucydides, but present for his readers. This view Mr Powell rejects on the ground that it strains *τὸ σαφὲς σκοπεῖν* and that if T. meant this he has been criminally obscure. Mr Powell refers for the correct explanation to Shilleto.

Shilleto's note is itself far from lucid. He begins by suggesting that *τὸ σαφὲς* can only be understood with *τῶν μελλόντων* by means of a zeugma. In this case T. is presumably taken to mean 'to investigate the certainty of the past and (to gain a general idea) of what in all likelihood will be very much like the past hereafter'. But this zeugma *ex machina* can scarcely

save T. from the charge of criminal obscurity, and indeed in what follows S. appears to abandon it. He goes on to quote from the passage on the plague in 2, 48, 4—*ἀφ' ὧν ἂν τις σκοπῶν, εἴποτε καὶ αὖθις ἐπιπέσοι, μάλιστα ἂν ἔχοι τι προειδῶς μὴ ἀγνοεῖν*—and adds 'if I am *προειδῶς* I have *τὸ σαφὲς τῶν μελλόντων*. If *past* history is a safe guide to *future*, surely one may be pardoned for saying "past events may give a *clear insight*"<sup>1</sup> into those events which will probably come"<sup>2</sup>. Here the quotation from Book 2 does not help; for clearly, even though *προειδῶς*, I have not *τὸ σαφὲς τῶν μελλόντων* until the condition *εἴποτε κτλ* is fulfilled, but then the situation of which I have *τὸ σαφὲς* is no longer

<sup>1</sup> S.'s italics.

<sup>2</sup> Zeugma is apparently here abandoned and 'clear insight' suggested as a rendering which will cover *τὸ σαφὲς* as referring both to *τῶν γενομένων* and to *τῶν μελλόντων*.

future. And the last sentence I have quoted from S. does nothing to clear up the matter. Either it means that a knowledge of the past will produce clear insight into future situations *when those situations arise*, in which case S. gives the same interpretation as G., or else it is a plain *non sequitur*. For granting that the historian of the Spanish civil war may gain a clear insight into it from acquaintance with T.'s account of *στάσεις*,<sup>1</sup> it is simply a misuse of words to say that he therefore at the present moment has a clear insight into what may happen in Spain tomorrow or next month. This may be the converse of straining *τὸ σαφές σκοπεῖν*, but is not the result rather too loose?

Again, is it true that T. was criminally obscure if he meant the futurity of *τῶν μελλόντων κτλ* to be future for himself, but not for his reader? I can see no *prima facie* reason why the words he uses should bear one sense rather than the other, and he may well have thought that no one would take him as predicating *τὸ σαφές* of the future while it was still future. In this supposition he was wrong and therefore perhaps obscure. But is the crime all on his side?

(2) It is hardly fair to cite the speech of the Athenians at Sparta and the Melian dialogue as instances of speeches incompatible with the principle *ἐχομένῳ ὅτι ἐγγύτατα τῆς ξυμπάσης γνώμης τῶν ἀληθῶς λεχθέντων*, since G. on p. 100 expressly admits the possibility that in these two cases the principle was not applied.

(3) Mr Powell thinks it impossible to interpret *τὰ δέοντα* as said from the standpoint of Thucydides. He does not say why, and he criticizes G. for 'passing lightly' over the clause in which the words occur. Yet he him-

self passes over the same clause so lightly that in quoting it he omits the vital words *ἐδόκουν ἐμοί*. These words by their emphatic position and their contrast with *οὐδ' ὥς ἐμοὶ ἐδόκει* immediately below go far to justify G.'s contention that what T. is here stressing is the comparative subjectivity of his method in treating the speeches, whereas in the words *ἐχομένῳ κτλ* he is merely claiming that this subjectivity has not been exercised in a purely arbitrary fashion, but has some basis in actuality.<sup>2</sup>

(4) Why must we 'guard against supposing that T. was necessarily as conscious as ourselves of the gulf between his programme and his practice', supposing such a gulf to exist? If the gulf was as wide as Mr Powell imagines and T. was unaware of it, he becomes rather a blind guide along the path of history.

(5) 'It is more natural that such a programme was formulated before than after the speeches themselves were created.' If by this Mr Powell merely means that the only natural way of explaining the supposed gulf between T.'s programme and his practice is to imagine that he wrote the programme before he started writing the speeches, that may be granted. But it remains startling that a historian should elaborate a programme and then abide by it in no single instance, which is apparently what Mr Powell believes. If on the other hand he means that there is some *a priori* naturalness in supposing that T. wrote c. 22 before he had written the speeches, it is difficult to agree with him. An unbiassed reading of c. 22 suggests that it is describing a method which *has been* followed.

A. R. W. HARRISON.

Merton College, Oxford.

<sup>1</sup> S.'s past history as a safe guide to future (*sc.* future history).

<sup>2</sup> Does not Mr Powell rather beg the question when he assumes that in this sentence T. is claiming for his speeches 'dramatic probability'?

### Q. MUCIUS SCAEVOLE THE PONTIFEX AND ORNATIO PROVINCIAE.

CONCERNING the administration of Asia by Q. Mucius P. f. Scaevola the pontifex, we possess a certain amount of positive information. P. Rutilius Rufus was one of his legati.<sup>1</sup> His provincial edict was so admirable that succeeding governors of Asia were commanded by senatorial decree to model their own edicts upon it; and Cicero in 51 B.C. borrowed at least one of its clauses for his Cilician edict.<sup>2</sup> Finally, Scaevola left his province at the end of nine months, an act which did no harm to his reputation and to which Cicero later looked back with envy: *et simul hanc gloriam iustitiae et abstinentiae fore illustriorem spero, si cito decesserimus: id quod Scaevolae contigit, qui solos novem menses Asiae praefuit*.<sup>3</sup>

A second reference to Scaevola's premature departure from his province has been found by certain historians in a passage of Asconius, on the strength of which they have held that Scaevola went to Asia as proconsul in 94 B.C., at the end of the consulship which he held, with L. Crassus the orator as colleague, in 95 B.C. Asconius, commenting on Cicero, in *Pisonem* 62, states: *L. autem Crasso collega fuit Q. Scaevola pontifex: qui, cum animadverteret Crasso propter summam eius in re publica potentiam ac dignitatem senatum in decernendo triumpho gratificari, non dubitavit rei publicae magis quam collegae habere rationem ac ne fieret S.C. intercessit. Idem provinciam, cuius cupiditate plerique etiam boni viri deliquerant, deposuerat ne sumptui esset † oratio*.<sup>4</sup>

Crassus claimed his triumph on the score of military successes in Cisalpine Gaul. It has therefore been held by A. Schneider,<sup>5</sup> T. Reinach,<sup>6</sup> and F. Münzer<sup>7</sup> that Cisalpine Gaul and

Asia were the consular provinces for 95 B.C., and that the consuls proceeded to them on the expiry of their consulship. Scaevola, on this view, stayed only nine months in Asia. He was therefore back in Rome and frustrated Crassus' attempt to secure a triumph at the end of 94 B.C. or in the following year.

There are objections to this interpretation. If it is right, by *collega* Asconius must mean not 'colleague', but 'ex-colleague'. Such a meaning would be unusual but, no doubt, is not impossible. Further, *deponere provinciam*, though no doubt a possible, is an unusual, expression for 'leaving a province'. *Provincia decedere* or *de provincia decedere* is the usual expression.<sup>8</sup>

Indeed, *deponere provinciam* appears to have been a technical term for 'resigning a province on appointment'. Since the passing of the Lex Sempronia de Provinciis Consularibus, the consuls elect knew even before their election which were to be the two consular provinces. Either before or after entering upon office they cast lots to settle which consul should have which province. After they entered upon office as consuls, the Senate passed a Bill of Supplies for each of the consular provinces: in technical language, *ornavit provincias*. If either of the consuls did not wish to proceed to provincial government, he could resign his province. In such a case, *deposuit provinciam*. The technical use of the expressions *ornare provinciam* and *deponere provinciam* is frequent in Cicero's writings.<sup>9</sup> In one passage (in *Pisonem* 2, 5) they can be found in association with one another: *ego provinciam Galliam senatus auctoritate*

<sup>1</sup> Not, as is stated by Pseudo-Asconius, p. 202 (Stangl), quaestor.

<sup>2</sup> Valerius Maximus 8, 15, 6, Cicero, *ad Att.* 6, 1, 15 (T.P. 3, 252).

<sup>3</sup> *Att.* 5, 17, 5 (T.P. 3, 209).

<sup>4</sup> in *Pisonianam* 13.

<sup>5</sup> *Die drei Scaevola Cicero's*, Munich, 1879, pp. 60 ff., n. 78.

<sup>6</sup> *Mithridate Eupator*, Paris, 1890, p. 108 n.

<sup>7</sup> Pauly-Wissowa IA, col. 1273 f., s.v. Rutilius no. 34; XVI, col. 438 f., s.v. Mucius no. 22.

<sup>8</sup> Suetonius, *Divus Julius* 18, 1; Cicero, *Q. f.* 1, 2, 8 (T.P. 1, 53); *Att.* 3, 9, 1 (T.P. 1, 65); *Fam.* 2, 19, 1 (T.P. 3, 262); *Att.* 6, 3, 1 f. (T.P. 3, 264); *Att.* 6, 4, 1 (T.P. 3, 268); *Fam.* 2, 15, 4 (T.P. 3, 273); *Pro Q. Ligario* 1, 2.

<sup>9</sup> *Fam.* 5, 2, 3 (T.P. 1, 15), ut primum in catione provinciam deposuerim; in *Pisonem* 2, 5, provinciam deposui; *Att.* 2, 1, 3 (T.P. 1, 27); *Q. f.* 2, 3, 1 (T.P. 2, 102), referebatur de ordinandis praetoribus; *Att.* 3, 24, 2 (T.P. 1, 85), neque enim unquam arbitror ornatas esse provincias designatorum; cf. Suetonius, *Divus Julius* 18, 1.



*exercitu et pecunia instructam et ornatam*  
... *in contione deposui*.

There is, therefore, a strong temptation to interpret *provinciam deposuerat*, in the passage of Asconius quoted above, in a technical sense. In that case, Scaevola as consul in 95 B.C. resigned his province (whatever that province was), and at the beginning of 94 B.C. retired into private life instead of proceeding to a provincial command. Further the word *collega* may be allowed to mean 'colleague', not 'ex-colleague', if it was during 95 B.C., the year of his consulship, that Crassus campaigned in Cisalpine Gaul and made his unsuccessful request for a triumph; for the pluperfect *deposuerat* could, on the above interpretation, be used of Scaevola while he was still consul.

The last word in the passage of Asconius is marked by the editors as corrupt. The manuscripts offer us *oratio* or *oro*. Manutius suggested *aerario*; Professor A. C. Clark *populo Romano*. Both suggestions make good sense, but neither explains satisfactorily the appearance of the meaningless *oratio*. It is extremely tempting to suggest the addition of a single letter, the replacement of *oratio* by *ornatio*.

The expression *ornare provincias* was, as we have seen, a common one. Was there a corresponding verbal noun *ornatio provinciae*, meaning 'the voting of supplies for a province', on the analogy, for instance, of *aestimatio frumenti*?<sup>1</sup> The phrase *ornatio provinciae* occurs frequently in the history books. It is used, for example, by Mr. G. H. Stevenson in *C.A.H.* ix, p. 459; it is used by Mr. J. M. Cobban in his book *Senate and Provinces*.<sup>2</sup> I have not been able, however, to discover any classical authority for the expression. It is not to be found in the *Lexicon Ciceronianum*. Lewis and Short state that the word *ornatio* is not ante-Augustan and is very rare. When it is found, it appears to be used in an architectural context and to mean an ornament. None the less there is a strong temptation to think that Asconius used it as a verbal noun, formed from *ornare pro-*

*vinciam*. An expression so rare and technical might easily have been corrupted to the meaningless *oratio* of the MSS.

If this suggestion is correct, Scaevola must have governed Asia as praetor or, in the year following his praetorship, as propraetor. The year of his praetorship cannot, by the conditions of the *lex annalis*, have been later than 98 B.C., and that may very well have been the actual year of his provincial government.<sup>3</sup>

It has to be admitted that, at first sight, the sad history of P. Rutilius Rufus appears to suit 94 B.C. as the year in which Scaevola was governor of Asia, rather than 98 B.C. Rutilius was a *legatus* on Scaevola's staff,<sup>4</sup> and was left in charge of the province during the interval between Scaevola's departure and the arrival of his successor—whose name and date are alike unknown to us.<sup>5</sup> Rutilius was a consular, and the staff of a proconsul was a more congenial place for a consular than was the staff of a praetor or a propraetor. Yet in either case the appearance of Rutilius is surprising; he had stood for the consulship of 115 B.C.,<sup>6</sup> and was therefore almost a generation older than Scaevola.

<sup>1</sup> This date is accepted by Professor H. M. Last in *C.A.H.* ix, p. 175. Professor F. de Zulueta, *C.A.H.* ix, p. 850, gives the year 100 B.C., but in that year Scaevola was at Rome, a staunch defender of law and order (Cicero, *pro Rab. perd.* 21 and 26; *Phil.* 8, 15). Whether he administered Asia as praetor or as propraetor we do not know, for ancient historians allowed themselves great latitude in their descriptions of a provincial governor's titles. Livy, *Epit.* 70, calls Scaevola proconsul, inscriptions *ἀνθύμαρος* (*O.G.I.S.* 437) and *στρατηγός ἀνθύμαρος* (*O.G.I.S.* 439). Diodorus refers to him (37, 5, 1-6) as *στρατηγός*, and Pseudo-Asconius (p. 202, Stangl) as praetor. The passage which clinched the matter for Mommsen, Cicero, *De Oratore* 1, 17, 75, will not help us, for it refers not to Scaevola the pontifex, but to his second cousin the augur, who had governed Asia in 120 or 119 B.C.

<sup>2</sup> This was Rutilius' only known official visit to Asia. The view of W. H. Waddington, *Fastes des provinces asiatiques*, pp. 32 ff., based on the statement of Pomponius, in the *Digest* 1, 2, 40, that Rutilius had previously governed Asia independently as proconsul in 111 or 110 B.C., has, rightly, failed to win any support.

<sup>3</sup> With the possible exception of C. Julius Caesar, father of the dictator, we know of no governor of Asia but Scaevola in the period 107-90 B.C.

<sup>4</sup> Cicero, *Brutus* 30, 113.

<sup>1</sup> *Verr.* 2, 3, 189 ff.

<sup>2</sup> *E.g.* pp. 94, 154 ff.

Rutilius' trial was in 92 B.C.<sup>1</sup> This would have followed close on his return from Asia, had he been there, under Scaevola, in 94 B.C. If Scaevola governed in 98 B.C., there was an interval between Rutilius' return to Rome and his trial. But this objection, again, is not strong enough to be fatal to the view that Scaevola governed Asia in 98 B.C. For our knowledge of Rutilius' trial, our picture of an innocent man—*vir non saeculi sui sed omnis aevi optimus*<sup>2</sup>—caught in the toils of equestrian intrigue—*conspiratione publicanorum percussus*<sup>3</sup>—is chiefly derived, though indirectly, from Rutilius' own account of himself, whether his autobiography or his Greek History.<sup>4</sup> E. Pais<sup>5</sup> makes the attractive suggestion that Rutilius was accused of taking bribes from Mithridates, that Marius had collected the evidence when he was in the East, and that the attack on Rutilius was a trial case, preparing the way for the *quaestio Variana* of the next year. In that case Rutilius was a victim of the political situation of 92 B.C., and his

enemies—of whom there were several<sup>6</sup>—used the most convenient handle that they could.

Diodorus<sup>7</sup> informs us that Q. Scaevola paid all his expenses as governor of Asia out of his own pocket. He was therefore acting consistently in 95 B.C. when he refused a province on the ground that he did not wish to involve the state in the expense of *ornatio*. He was a good Stoic, and the expression of this sentiment did him credit. The province allotted to him, however,—Asconius does not tell us what the province was—had to have a governor, and the governor had to have his expenses paid. Scaevola's gesture cannot, therefore, have conferred any concrete benefit on the Roman treasury. In view of the fact that he had not the hardihood to endure a full year's relegation when he was governor of Asia earlier, it may be suggested that, in spite of the excellence of his edict (like Cicero's in Cilicia) and the institution of the *Mucia* by the grateful provincials of Asia, he had no more love than Cicero for the life of provincial administration.

J. P. V. D. BALSDON.

Exeter College, Oxford.

<sup>1</sup> It can be dated with confidence from its place in the narrative of Livy, *Epitome* 70.

<sup>2</sup> Velleius Paterculus 2, 13.

<sup>3</sup> Valerius Maximus 2, 10, 5.

<sup>4</sup> See E. Pais, *Dalle guerre puniche a Cesare Augusto* 1, pp. 46 ff., especially pp. 74 ff., and G. L. Hendrickson, 'The Memoirs of Rutilius Rufus', *C.P.* 28 (1933), pp. 153-175.

<sup>5</sup> *L.c.*, pp. 56 ff.

<sup>6</sup> E.g. Aemilius Scaurus (Cicero, *De Oratore* 2, 280, *Brutus* 113; Tacitus, *Annals* 3, 66); Marius (Plutarch, *Marius* 28, 8); Pompeius Strabo (Plutarch, *Pompey* 37, 4).

<sup>7</sup> 37, 5, 1.

#### 'COCK' IN LATIN: A POSTSCRIPT.

To the instances of *gallus gallinaceus* which were given in *C.R.* L 165 add Petronius 47, 10, where Trimalchio mentions *gallum gallinaceum*, *penthiacum et eius modi nenias*, showing that the fuller term was still that of everyday speech.

University of Sydney.

G. P. SHIPP.

#### TWO PHRYGIAN EPITAPHS: A CORRECTION.

IN *C.R.* L 214, inscription No. 1, l. 3, read  $\kappa\eta\lambda\alpha\rho\beta\alpha\upsilon\epsilon$ .

W. M. CALDER.

University of Edinburgh.

## REVIEWS

### GREEK STUDIES.

1. *Humanism and Technique in Greek Studies*. An Inaugural Lecture delivered before the University of Oxford. By E. R. DODDS, Regius Professor of Greek. Pp. 17. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1936. Paper, 1s. 6d.
2. *Greece and Rome*. Vols. iv, v, vi (Nos. 11 to 16). Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1935-6. 3s. each number.
3. *The Odyssey*. Presidential Address delivered to the Classical Association. By the Rt. Hon. L. S. AMERY.

Pp. 27. London: Murray, 1936.  
Paper, 1s.

THE new Regius Professor of Greek at Oxford, entering on his office at a time of 'intellectual ferment, moral upheaval and political violence,' addresses himself to his fellow professionals and invites them to take stock of their position. Of the value of the Greek humanistic ethic in an age of moral unsettlement he has no doubt; and he looks forward hopefully to the influence of Greek theory and practice on the literature and art of the next generation. Nor has the successor of his distinguished predecessor any sympathy for those who sneer at popularization through renewed interpretation and retranslation of the Greek classics. By humanism in education he means 'the assumption that the study of man—man as thinker, as artist, as social and moral being—matters more to men than the study of what may roughly be called 'brute fact.' And the classical curriculum 'begins with the mastery of a domain of brute fact . . . for language, which is a living thing when we use it to express our thoughts and feelings, takes on the character of brute fact as soon as we study it analytically.' Nor is linguistic itself any longer the sole quarry of brute fact; the modern student wanders in 'a whole forest of collateral techniques'—palaeography, epigraphy, papyrology, numismatics, archaeology—all of them liable, according to the use made of them, to lead the student to the 'central hearth' of Hellenism or to side-track him into some form of specialized research. What, in practice, is to be the relation of 'research' to the humanism which all admit to be the final cause of Greek studies? Professor Dodds, himself a distinguished 'technician,' has some timely words to say on the perils of premature research. The opportunities afforded by research scholarships, the lure of doctorates, the pressure put on young scholars to 'get something out,' are in danger of producing a generation of Grecians who have forgotten why we learn Greek at all—'in order to read Greek books.' A modern Gulliver might easily come on a young Lilliputian earnestly at work on the

clausulae of the *I.G.* and declining to read Thucydides because he has been read before. That way lies a definite break with the tradition which has kept Greek studies alive, both in this country and elsewhere, since the Renaissance.

Professor Dodds' advice to the young scholar to make himself a humanist before he becomes a specialist is wise; at another point he seems to the writer to lay himself open to misunderstanding. He quotes once more Principal Scott's well-known remark that 'he who learns from one occupied in learning drinks of a running stream; he who learns from one who has learned all he is to teach drinks the green mantle of a stagnant pool.' Shall we then, asks Professor Dodds, engage in research in order to make ourselves better teachers? His answer is that in his own experience the periods in which he was engaged in technical research were not marked by any enhancement of his effectiveness as a teacher. With all respect, I do not believe a word of it. 'What chiefly gives vitality to a man's teaching is not this or that small factual discovery' (no one claims that it is)—'or even his joy in the process of such discovery, but rather his power continually to relive in his own person . . . a great experience in which other men have lived before him.' This is true; vital interpretation, integration, is part of good teaching, but not the whole. The writer attended lectures, on the whole pretty assiduously, as a matriculated student in six Universities. He looks back with admiration on many a finished piece of dramatization. But the teaching to which he is obliged to acknowledge most profit was that of two men who never pretended to present the truth as a finished entity realized here and now, but always as something just round the corner; whose lecture-rooms were workshops in which the materials were assembled, the tools displayed, the craftsman seen at work. The 'joy of discovery' can be communicated, and is a vital part of teaching. Both the men of whom I speak were ardent researchers and builders of knowledge.

*Greece and Rome* continues to combine its mission of enlightened popularization with much useful advice and practical help to those engaged in classical teaching. The three volumes under review cast their net wide and illustrate many aspects of Greek and Roman civilization. Discussions on poetry, history, philosophy, the novel, even children and their games and pets; or again articles on the teaching of history and grammar, the use of inscriptions to illustrate life and history, meet and mingle with versions, crosswords, acrostics and what not. The plates illustrating Greek and Roman art, everyday life, and scenery are admirably reproduced. The editors are to be congratulated on such contributions as Professor Dobson's *Circe*, an original satirical drama in Greek, with a metrical paraphrase, brimful of wit (in l. 132, *φῶτος*, the joke is against Professor Dobson; in l. 177, *ὀλωλόταν*, against the printer)—and Professor Cornford's remarkable Samuel Dill Memorial Lecture on Plato's Commonwealth. The editing on its technical side is good; a few pinpricks may make it even better. To suppose that the walls of Athens were pulled down at the end of the Peloponnesian War (Vol. VI, p. 41) is one of the mistakes that matter; see C.R. xxvi, p. 247. To let pass 'Kingship' for *βασιλεια* (p. 12) disguises the question about the Queen in the last scene of the *Birds*. The Greek type is good, but the proof-readers must mind their δ's and λ's—*ὁ δ' εὐκοδοῦς μὲν ἐνθαδ' (sic) εὐκολὸς δ' ἐκεῖ* is a rather upsetting line.

In preparation for his presidential address to the Classical Association, Mr Amery has 'dipped into' the vast mass of literature which has been written about Homer in recent years, and has attempted to place Odysseus in his historical setting. He suggests that the ruler whom Agamemnon and Menelaos visited in person was something more than the mere leader of a dozen Cephallenian ships. 'He may have been only a vassal in respect of the Achaean islands, but with great resources of his own, like the Dukes of Normandy who were also Kings of England, acknowledged leader of a western confederacy or even ruler of an empire of the west which has left no record except the memory of its creator's greatness.' In support of this suggestion he quotes Hesiod's statement that the Tyrrhenians were ruled by sons of Odysseus and Circe, and other later passages connecting him with Italy. Another suggestive fact is that Odysseus, alone of the Achaean heroes, had his own western name Ulixes, pointing to 'an Italian reputation separate from and earlier than any Roman study of Greek Literature.'

I select this item, which Mr Amery throws out for the consideration of experts, from a charming study of Homer's treatment of his—and Mr Amery's—favourite hero. The lecture is the best sort of testimony to the value and enduring interest of Greek studies. May Professor Dodds help to mould many such students.

W. M. CALDER.

University of Edinburgh.

### ROOTS OF THE TREE.

*Roots of the Tree*, by Carleton STANLEY.  
Pp. 107. London: Milford, 1936.  
Cloth, 5s.

In a short preface to this book, which is a reprint of articles in various periodicals, the President of Dalhousie University says that the essays therein appear to him 'to be chapters in an estimate of our present European civilization,' and that statement gives a useful clue to the nature of the book. The matters discussed are familiar to

scholars, but the author, with that clue before him, often throws fresh light upon them and stimulates thought. In the first chapter, 'An Ancient Economic Cycle 750-432 B.C.', he suggests analogies with the economic developments in Europe between the mid sixteenth century and 1900. In the next, upon Greek Science, in a clear historical sketch he lays especial stress on three points, challenging what he believes to be the current opinion that Greek science

was of brief duration, that it neglected experiment, and that it was hampered by lack of equipment. The first point he makes good, on the others he perhaps overstates his case. After all, there is no denying that Greek science made relatively little use of experiment, and even Archimedes would have welcomed the resources of a modern laboratory.

The essay on Thucydides is perhaps the best in the book, for the author knows and loves him well, and makes some good points. But he is less scientific than usual when he says (p. 62) that the plague at Athens was 'caused' by overcrowding, for that could only aggravate it. The essay on Lucretius shows real appreciation, but perhaps exaggerates his scientific gifts. The

man who is content, as Lucretius often is, to leave the reader to choose, between several contradictory explanations, is hardly a pure scientist. And here and there the author seems to be tilting at windmills. There cannot be many nowadays who think Lucretius 'unrespectable'; and if he was neglected till recent times, it is improbable that the Stoics, whom the author regards as the arch-enemies of science, were to blame for that.

In an interesting discussion of Cretan Art the author claims the Cretans as the first 'Europeans' in a political and moral sense. It is attractive, but one feels a doubt whether Sir Arthur Evans himself would claim such a knowledge of Cretan politics and religion as is here implied.

F. R. EARP.

#### THE TEUBNER ANTHOLOGIA LYRICA GRAECA.

E. DIEHL: *Anthologia Lyrica Graeca*. Vol. I. Pp. 640. Leipzig: Teubner, 1936. Export prices: bound, RM. 11.70; paper, 10.65.

THE first edition of Diehl's *Anthologia Lyrica Graeca* appeared in 1925. The new edition follows the main lines of the old, except that the pages are not now numbered continuously throughout but in four sections, each of which begins with page 1. In detail much has been changed and much added. Diehl has kept up with the literature of the subject and has missed very little of importance. If occasionally he reports views which seem untenable, it is at least useful to have them for reference. In his text he might perhaps have included the epigram on Marathon attributed to Aeschylus and the line of Mimnermus contained in the papyrus commentary on Antimachus. But perhaps he found these too late for the printer. So too his text of Sophocles' Paean belongs to a time before the Americans discovered more of it in the Agora.

This book will be indispensable to all readers of Greek lyric poetry. It will therefore not perhaps be impertinent to mention some places where Diehl's text is open to dispute, though of course on such matters certainty is a distant ideal. Metre is a thorny question, but I cannot

bring myself to believe that Sappho wrote the lines printed as hers at 118, 131. 2, 135. 7, or Corinna 4. 26 or 5. 85, while the metrical conspectus of her 15 certainly agrees with the accepted text but is in no known metre. Nor does it seem probable that Sappho ended glyconics with an open short vowel at 96. 20 and 99. 2. In her prosody too she was probably more strict than Diehl makes her and would not scan the first syllable of *κάλα* long at 48. 1. Nor need we assume that Anacreon used the paragogic *ν* to lengthen the final syllable of *δμμοσι* at 88. 1.

Dialect too is a vexed question, but it looks as if the Lesbian poets were on the whole strict and consistent in their use of the vernacular. It is therefore improbable that Sappho wrote *κατάρρει* at 5. 4; the correct form would be *καρρεί*, and Sitzler's *κατέρρει* is highly convincing. So too she probably wrote *ἀήδω* at 121 and *Πείθων* at 1. 18, and is unlikely to have written *ἴσος* at 123. 5 and *ἄν* at 128. 2. Nor do I believe that *φώνας οὐδεν* at 2. 7 really makes sense—incidentally the correction *φώναισ'* was first made not by Lobel but by Daniels—son—or that the Attic form *πορφύρα* at 55a. 9 is for *πορφύρα(ι)α*. There is more trouble about Corinna's digamma than meets the unwary eye, and



Anacreon can hardly have written *αἰνοπαθῆ* for *αἰνοπαθέα* at 56. Nor can Alcaeus have written the disyllabic *\*Αρηι* at 54. 1 instead of the regular trisyllabic—and therefore untenable—*\*Αρενι*.

Supplements to papyri are always highly disputable, but the remaining letters make it look as if *ἀπαλοσφύρων* were much more likely than *τανυσφύρων* at Sappho 55a. 15, and if we read *παώθεις* at Alcaeus 43. 6, the old supplement of *γάμωι* is at least otiose. Even if the

papyrus really gives *κατ' αὐτμενα* at Sappho 55a. 9 we are still in the dark about its meaning, and Diehl's restorations at Sappho 25. 5-8 and Alcaeus 74. 9-11 are extremely hard to translate. Finally, would Erinna speak of playthings lying warm in her heart at 1B. 19, and would the barking of dogs be more appropriate at the funeral of Baucis than the laments of her friends?

C. M. BOWRA.

Wadham College, Oxford.

### ARISTOPHANES AND PANHELLENISM.

W. M. HUGILL: *Panhellenism in Aristophanes*. Pp. viii + 106. Chicago: University of Chicago Press (Cambridge: University Press), 1936. Cloth, 7s.

THIS essay is an analysis of the *Lysistrata*, and especially of the famous wool-working simile (ll. 572-586), and of Aristophanes' other plays of the war period in relation to it. Dr. Hugill starts with the assumption that Aristophanes was a politician rather than a poet, that is, that he had always a practical political aim—a policy to advocate—and that, as a politician, he was a wise and a profound thinker. He was, we are told, by no means opposed to the democratic constitution; he admired the old pre-war democracy, and if he was an enemy of the imperialist demagogues, he disliked no less the factious oligarchs and especially their revolutionary methods. This being so, Dr. Hugill can persuade himself of the truth of the following propositions: (1) that in the *Lysistrata*, whereas the heroine's aims are those of the poet, and therefore noble and good, her methods, being like those of the oligarchs, 'deserve and receive the abuse and criticism' of the chorus of men; (2) that the men are persuaded by her arguments, not brought to their knees by her methods, to agree to peace; (3) from the wool-simile and ll. 1162-72, that Aristophanes' terms of peace were the *status quo ante bellum*; (4) that this was a wise and reasonable proposal for a moderate Athenian to make in 412;

(5) that these conditions of 432, to be imposed by Sparta and Athens on the rest of Greece (as in 421?), gave a reasonable guarantee of permanent peace; (6) that, in relation to the empire, they were the same as in Cimon's day (e.g., the cleruch-system is mentioned by Aristophanes 'only with disapproval', the evidence for this being simply *Nub.* 203-5, 211-3; and 'the cloak is for Demos' (l. 586), but not for imperialist Demos, for 'the essence of Lysistrata's plan is the negation of imperialism, the restoration of confederation'); and (7) that in Cimon's day the allies 'were glad to pay for the support of the fleet'. The rest of the plays are shown to support this idyllic picture of Aristophanes as politician; so that they turn out to be like a series of good leading articles in a good conservative paper, or the speeches of Isocrates.

Dr. Hugill could quote distinguished scholars who have before him upheld his main assumptions. To me they are highly improbable, and not made less so by the shifts and twists of argument and the self-deceptions apparent in this book and necessary for their support. That his knowledge of Greek usage is not impeccable either is shown by his opinion that the absence of the article before *Εὐβοεῖσι* in Lysias xxxiv 3 shows that not the whole of Euboea or any whole community in Euboea is meant, but only some of the inhabitants.

A. W. GOMME.

University of Glasgow.

ARISTOTLE *DE CAELO*.

Aristotelis *De Caelo* libri IV. Recog-  
novit brevique adnotatione critica  
instruxit D. J. ALLAN. (Scr. Class.  
Bibl. Oxon.) Oxford: Clarendon  
Press, 1936. Cloth, 7s. 6d.

THE appearance of the *De caelo* among the Oxford Classical Texts is to be welcomed for more than one reason. First, it is a venture into Aristotle's theoretical philosophy on the part of a series which had hitherto confined itself to the *Ethics*, *Politics* and *Constitution of Athens*. Secondly, the editor's age is proof that the enthusiasm for Aristotelian studies at Oxford, kindled in the days of Bywater and notably maintained today, is finding a response in the minds of those who will be able to carry it yet further into the future. These are external reasons; it is more important that the volume can be given an unstinted welcome for its own sake.

Since Bekker, the only text produced had been that of C. Prantl, which appeared in the Teubner series in 1881, and whose editor paid scant attention either to the manuscripts themselves or to the valuable evidence of the Greek commentators. Mr. J. L. Stocks in his translation (Oxford, 1922) took this text as a basis, though he added many important textual notes of his own.<sup>1</sup> Mr. Allan has taken pains to become familiar with the sources unknown to Bekker (e.g. the Vienna ms. J, and the text underlying the Latin version of William of Moerbeke), to re-examine the better known mss., and to give full weight to the testimonies of Simplicius and Alexander. He concludes that the mss. fall into two main groups, of which E and J are respectively the most important members. These two differ in a way that suggests a divergence of policy rather than the chance errors of a scribe. The reading of E usually attributes to Aristotle a rougher, simpler, more telegraphic diction, that of J a diction

fuller and more finished. And Mr. Allan argues that, other things being equal, the former is more likely to represent the style of Aristotle himself. If the method seems, from this brief description, to rely too much on a *priori* argument, I can only add that a reading of Mr. Allan's own discussion of the question,<sup>2</sup> as well as of his text, will dispel the suspicion. He is not for nothing a follower of the father of induction, and his general choice (in his own words) of *cistellam plumbeam* need arouse no qualms. Isolated passages can indeed be found which contravene his principle. A striking one may be quoted here. 274b32 (if an infinite body had a natural motion, there would have to be another infinite space into which it could move): ὥστε καὶ τόπος ἄλλος ἴσος εἰς ὃν οἰσθήσεται. ἴσος E, om. J. Here we have an explanatory word in E and related authorities which is absent from the J-group. Nevertheless the editor is alive to the existence of contrary instances of this sort, and is right not to let them weaken his main hypothesis.

Punctuation is all-important, and has received the attention it deserves. I would only suggest, tentatively, that the hypothesis which Mr. Allan uses so effectively in questions of reading is equally applicable here. It is possible to make Aristotle too tidy. To take an instance, is it necessary, at 277a15, to separate the words *πάσα δὲ πεπερασμένη μεταβολή* from what follows by including them in a parenthesis? The ensuing *οἶον κτλ* may quite as well serve to illustrate them as to illustrate the general statement at the beginning of the sentence. (Thus: 'Now every change is within fixed limits, e.g. for a patient who is being cured it is between sickness and health, for anything growing it is between smallness and greatness'. With the former illustration, EN 1173a23 might be compared, where health is said to be *ὥρισμένη*.) Similarly the first clause in the parenthesis

<sup>1</sup> Prantl's text in the Teubner series was the successor of one which he published in 1857 (Leipzig, Engelmann). It is curious that there are a number of misprints and incorrect readings noted by Stocks as occurring in the Teubner edition which are absent from the earlier one.

<sup>2</sup> See, as well as the preface to his text, a paper in *Class. Quart.* 1936, pp. 16 ff.

may as well not be separated from what precedes.

It is perhaps unusual to dwell on the preface as a literary genre, but this one is exemplary. It is written in a lively and readable Latin. Though far from neglecting purely textual questions, it includes remarks on the general character of the *De caelo* and the value of an edition of it at the present day, and concludes with a summary of the treatise. These are legitimate attractions. Once

depart from purely textual matters (it might have been said), and it will be impossible to know where to stop. But Mr. Allan has succeeded, and his preface is a model not only of style but of structure. (He will hardly now resent it if I question the existence of a Latin word 'posterea', which appears on the last line of his page vi.)

W. K. C. GUTHRIE.

*Peterhouse, Cambridge.*

### PLOTINUS IN GERMAN.

*Plotins Schriften übersetzt.* Von Richard HARDER. Bände II und III. Pp. 206 and 196. Leipzig: Meiner, 1936. Paper, RM. 9.50 and 8 (cloth, M. 11 and 9.50).

IN welcoming two further instalments of Harder's translation (containing respectively treatises 22-29 and 30-38 in Porphyry's chronological order), I need not repeat what was said in this journal (xlv. 35) in a review of the first volume. I must emphasize, however, the great importance of Harder's work in the present state of Plotinian scholarship: it does not merely make Plotinus available in a clear and readable version for Greekless readers in Germany; for scholars all over the world it is an invaluable aid to the understanding of the most difficult of major Greek philosophical authors. In many passages where his predecessors took refuge either in vague paraphrase or in the obscurity of a literal rendering, Harder for the first time exhibits his author's meaning in a precise and unambiguous form. He has the good sense, moreover, to ignore much of the destructive activity of nineteenth-century editors: e.g. in II. ix. 8 § 70 and III. vi. 9 § 65 he dismisses the negatives introduced by Volkmann and Kirchhoff respectively, and blindly reprinted by their successors; in IV. iv. 33 § 178 he translates the manuscript reading *ἔχειν*, not Müller's foolish conjecture *λέγειν*; in VI. iv. 7 §§ 55-56 he ignores two disastrous 'corrections' due to Vitranga. There remain, however, as in the previous volume, a good many places where he is content to translate a

'traditional' text which has neither manuscript authority nor the excuse of being an improvement on the reading of the manuscripts: e.g. III. vi. 1 § 1 *fin.*, where Volkmann's *ἀν* is not wanted, the reference being probably, as in § 23, to IV. iv. 19 ff. (listed slightly out of order by Porphyry); III. vi. 6 § 41, where Kirchhoff's *ὁμολογεῖ* gives a much less lively sense than does *ὁμολογεῖν* ('forcing the things they strike to admit their existence'); III. viii. 5 § 30, where *τὴν αὐτήν* is sufficiently defended by § 34 *fin.* *τὸ αὐτό*; IV. iv. 3 § 15 (cf. C.Q. xxviii. 49); IV. iv. 27 *init.* § 128 (cf. *ibid.* 51).

When Harder introduces emendations of his own, as he is occasionally compelled to do, he gives (unwisely, I think) no indication of the fact; and some renderings which puzzle a reviewer may be puzzling merely for this reason. Allowing for this, I find fewer mis-translations in this version than in any previous one. In III. viii I have noticed the following:—c. 1 § 3 *init.*: *ἀρ' οὖν καὶ ἡμεῖς παίζοντες ἐν τῇ παρόντι θεωροῦμεν*; is not 'Ist denn aber auch unsere gegenwärtige Betrachtung selber nur Spiel?' but 'Well, then, is our own present game a form of contemplation?': for Plotinus has just said that it is a game, and goes on to say that in fact all play is disguised contemplation. c. 3 § 15: H.'s rendering of *ὁ μὲν ἄλλως ἄλλως* seems impossible to get from the Greek: supply *ἐστὶ θεωρία* (cf. the use of *ἄλλως* in c. 5 § 29). c. 8 § 49: I see no justification for translating *τὸ ὑποκείμενον* as 'das Subjekt' (i.e. the thinking subject?): the meaning seems to be



that as we pass from αἰσθησις to νόησις, the distinction between knowledge (τὰ ἐγνωσμένα) and the object of knowledge (τὸ ὑποκείμενον) tends to disappear: cf. V. v. 1, where τὸ γινωσκόμενον δι' αἰσθήσεως is contrasted with τὰ ὑποκείμενα or αὐτὸ τὸ πρᾶγμα.

Limitations of space forbid any full examination of the remaining treatises. I note in passing that in II. ix. 4 *init.* § 25 Harder, like his predecessors, misses the force of αὐτοί ('on their own authority,' in contrast with the authority of the *Phaedrus* implied in *περορρητῶσαν*); that in III. vi. 3 § 21 *διάχυσις*

is 'relaxation' rather than 'Durchrieselung' (cf. Arist. *Quint. de musica* 49. 6 *Jahn* ὅσα ἐς τε ἡδονὴν δαλεάζει καὶ ἡρέμα διαχεῖν τὴν γνώμην πέφυκε); and that in VI. vii. 6 § 49 *fin.* ἀνὰ λόγον τοῦ πυρὸς τοῦ ἐκεῖ φύσει cannot mean "entsprechend dem dort oben von Natur vorhandenen Feuer" (φύσει must be governed by ἀνὰ λόγον, or rather ἀνάλογον, and πυρὸς must depend on φύσει). But these are minor blemishes, which in a less careful translation would be scarcely worth remarking.

E. R. DODDS.

Christ Church, Oxford.

### PROCOPIUS AND PLUTARCH IN THE LOEB LIBRARY.

Procopius, with an English translation by H. B. DEWING. In seven volumes. VI: The *Anecdota* or *Secret History*. Pp. xxii + 384; 2 frontispieces (portraits of Justinian and Theodora); 2 maps.

Plutarch's *Moralia*, with an English translation by F. C. BABBITT. In fourteen volumes. IV: 263D-351B; pp. xiv + 553. V: 351C-438E; pp. xii + 515.

(Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann, 1935-6. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.) each volume.

THE surface of the Loeb *Anecdota* has many little flaws: a dozen such misprints as ὁ, η, ἐστὶ, δοῦναί; false stops (pp. 232, 252); unscholarly slips such as *Choeiphorae*, *φυλάσσειον*, 'Chersonese', 'practicing' (pp. 14, 15, 217, 237). For these the translator shares the blame with the proof-readers and the general editors; and 'Aetius Lamia' (p. 95) can hardly be his. More serious are 'what an excellent man had been lost from her life' for ὁποῖον αὐτῇ ἀγαθὸν ὠλόλει (i 38), 'fountain' for δεξαμενὴν (iii 24), 'each year' (which adds nothing to 'annual') for ἐς τὸν ἅπαντα αἰῶνα (xi 30). Memory of Lampriskos or Busby would have prevented 'toss in the air, as the children do on their way to school', for μετέωρον αἶρειν, οἷα τὰ ἐς γραμματιστοῦ φοιτῶντα παιδία (xvii 37); and the Greek makes Theodora dress the culprit down herself. 'Now though this man was a native of Palestine, he was

a very gentle and good person' (xxii 34) imports a contumely, for the Greek has just μέν and δέ. There is libel in a note on τῆς Ἀσίας γῆν τὴν πολλήν (xxiii 6), 'τὴν deleted by Reiske': no, γῆν. Why 'Tribunianus' for Τριβωνιανός (see the index), or 'blackmail' for συκοφαντεῖν (xxiii 1, 3; xxviii 15)? Can Sofia be described as 'back from Epidamnus' (p. 69)? Does ὀργάν mean 'be angry' in Procopius (xvi 22)?

On the other side is a large balance of good service, in introduction, translation, notes, and appendices, to all readers of this strange ill-written work.

A few stray comments may be added. A note on xxi 2 corrects the new Liddell and Scott s.v. *ἀερικόν*. The echo of Thucydides (I v 2) in xxi 13 might have been remarked. In xiv 10 should we read ἐν τῷ τῆς διανοίας (for δυνάμεως) *βεβαίω*, the odd phrase found in xiii 12 (see also xiv 21 and xv 1)? In ix 12 Reiske's *μόνον* <οὐκ> ἐκ παντὸς ἐργαζομένη τοῦ σώματος is not quite certain, for the last five words are no great exaggeration, and *μόνον* may go with what precedes, emphasizing the difference between *πεζαὶ ἐταῖραι* and the 'senior service', those who had skill on the flute or harp or in the dance.

(The rough draft of my comments on the two recent volumes of the Loeb *Moralia* has had the benefit of criticism by Mr. F. H. Sandbach, and I acknowledge some of my debts to him by [S.] )

These volumes contribute some good

conjectures by the editor: *φυτοῖς*, an improvement on *σίτοις*, for *αὐτὸς* at 269A; *ἀπὸ Νύσης* for *Διόνυσος* at 271B; *Δέκιοι* for *Λούκιοι*, in a list of Roman heroes, at 317D; *μεγάλανχος* (which I had pencilled in the new Teubner text) for *-ον* at 317E; *γοργώπας*, a fit epithet for the Erinyes (compare Eur. *Or.* 261, Soph. *O.C.* 84), for *γλώττας* at 370D; *πληρώσεως* for *ληρήσεως* at 383D; *ἔφθη* for *φησὶ* or *φήσει* at 391C; *τις* for *εἰς* at 391D; *εἰσδύμενος* for *ἐκ-* at 392F; *καλουμένων* for *καὶ ἔσομένων* at 395D [S.]; *μείνων* for *μειζ-* at 411A; *μαντείαν* for *μαντεῖον* at 431D.

Other readings at least indicate a fault that has been missed, or suggest a new line of attack: at 317A *πάλαι*, though perhaps not the best supplement [S.] and ill placed; at 353E *πύους* for *πυρός*, though it needs an infinitive; at 304C Capps's *τῶν ἄλλων* for *τῶν νεῶν*, for which I propose instead *τῶν ἐ*. But oftener than in the previous volumes, I think, a reading is put into the text which should have been put below it, if anywhere; and several changes are made which do harm to grammar or sense. For *ἐπέχει μοῖραν* at 290D see the new Liddell-and-Scott [S.]; but what is the authority for *ἀπέχει*? At 309C *νήσαντες* has to mean 'heaped upon her': with the *νόησαντες* of the MSS compare *νόησασα* in 314D [S.]. If not *λαχομένη* at 314D, certainly *ἀποφεύγοιο* at 355D is a Datism (see Ar. *Peace* 291). At 318D *αὐ τοὺς* robs us of *αὐτοὺς*, which is to the point. At 355A *εἰς* makes *σφαιροποίησιν* have to mean 'ball'. At 362B we are given by conjecture a *μέν* misplaced, and answered by a *τε*. At 374E the version represents *ἔρημα*, which is superior to the conjectural *ἔρημον* of the text [S.]. At 385A-B *ὥστε* for *ὥς* δὲ involves asyndeton. If at 399A the MSS gave *ὥσπερ εἰς πόντον . . . εἰς τὸν χρόνον*, the second *εἰς* would have to be ejected; but in fact it is an insertion due to F. E. Webb. At 435A *τοσοῦτω*, for *δοσ*, might pass, but not *τόσφ*. See also 304B, 323D, 325A, 327A (*βίαι λιμῶν*), 331A, 354F (*φυτοτομεῖν*, which would hardly mean 'lop'), 358A and B, 372D, 379C, 386D, 395B, 399D-E, 402D *ad fin.*, 414A, 424A, 432B.

One of the worst proposals, not put into the text, is at 286B: '*κάπτουσι*?'—as if eagles and hawks were gnats.

Let Plutarch paraphrase or even misquote for his purpose. At 395D we need *τοῦτ' ἢ μὲν ἦδεις πρὶν Θεόγνιν γεγενῆναι*, whatever may have been the original form of the trimeter; and the insertions at 405F and 432C give good Euripides but bad Plutarch.

Among notable conjectures here rejected are Pohlenz's *δήμων* at 306B and his *εὐροῦσι* at 375D, Bentley's *ἐαυτὸν* at 366D, Camerarius's *ἔπος* at 389D. On the other hand, at 321D *συνήθειαν* is well kept: compare Kipling's story 'The ship that found herself'.

Note 3 on 303E is defective, and note 5 on 312D inverts the truth.<sup>1</sup>

Apart from a few bad words, 'excrementitious', 'rarefaction', 'cardamum' (352D, 383C, E), the English is good, and it well represents the Greek. I note 'bull' for *βοῦν* at 274F; 'still . . . already' for *ἔτι . . . ἔτι*, and nothing for *πω*, at 284E (where the first *ἔτι* should surely be *ἤδη* or nothing); 'provoked' for *ταραχθεῖς* at 308E (where I suggest *παραταχθεῖς*: for the passive compare 315C); 'I would be Diogenes' (*should*), in Alexander's famous saying, at 331F; nothing for *ἐαυτῇ* in *ἐπορχουμένην ἐαυτῇ* (a difficult feat) at 336C; 'converting' for *διαγράφων* at 360A ('degrade', says the new Liddell-and-Scott, but perhaps rather something like 'analyse'); '(words) with meanings behind them' for *ὑποῦλους*, where I have proposed *ἐνόπλους* or simply *πολλούς*, at 394E. At 288D *περιττόν* in an arithmetical context is hard to translate, but 'eminent' needs a note. At 386B, in the version of *τοὺς ἀφ' ἱεροῦ κινήσας*, 'stirred up persons connected with the temple', which needs a *τοῦ*, the allusion to *τὸν ἀφ' ἱερᾶς κινεῖν* is missed. Why 'Tyndareis' at 426C (see C.R. L 2)? Other bad transliterations are 'Aix' and 'Tyads' at 293C, 'Lycaeon' for *Λύκαιον* at 300A.

<sup>1</sup> Let me append a few conjectures on passages in which this text offers nothing new. 335F-336A *δπλα καὶ χρήματα καὶ πόλεις καὶ ἱπποὺς*: <έλε> πόλεις? 341F *ὕδραν τέμνων δὲ τισὶ πολέμοις ἐπιβλάστανουσας*: αἰδίοις or δὲ πλείοσι? 351C *μείζων* <όν>.

Of a dozen misprints I will mention only 'Botson' and 'von Groningen' in the notes on 407B and 417A, and [S.] ποιήμαθ' διατιθέμενον, as in the new Teubner text, at 379A.

It is to such works as Plutarch's essays, which are corrupt, difficult, and little worthy to be read for their Greek, that the Loeb Library can render its best aid. That is why I have dwelt upon the faults of these two volumes,

with a view to improvements in a second edition.

In his five volumes, of which these two are not the best, Frank Cole Babbitt of Trinity College, Hartford, Connecticut, did yeoman service to scholarship; and I was very sorry to learn from the preface to the fourth volume, which came out after the fifth, that he died in the autumn of 1935. E. HARRISON.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

### STUDIES IN PALLADIUS.

J. SVENNUNG: *Untersuchungen zu Palladius und zur lateinischen Fach- und Volkssprache*. Pp. xxxv+698. Uppsala: Almqvist och Wiksell, 1935. Paper, Kr. 25.

IN 1926 J. Svennung published *Palladii Lib. XIV de Veterinaria Medicina*, which he had discovered in an Ambrosian MS. (C 212 inf.) between the previously known thirteen books of P. *de Agricultura* and the *Carmen de Institutione*. In the present work he defends anew its authenticity (I think, successfully) against the attack (*Eranos* 1928 and 1929) of H. Widstrand, a scholar whose *Palladiusstudien* (1926) certainly gave him the right to speak. The *Carmen* refers to Palladius' previous work as *bis septem libellos*: and S.'s discovery cleared away an arithmetical inexactitude which had exercised the ingenuity of previous commentators. It is admittedly difficult to prove the authenticity of a book which consists almost entirely of excerpts from predecessors. Nevertheless S. finds support for his contention in some details of language and method and in the continued use of the same sources, notably Anatolios, from whom, apparently, no other Latin writer draws directly.

The defence of *Lib. XIV* and of the *Carmen*, whose authenticity was also questioned by W., extends to nearly a hundred pages. The remainder of this very large volume is devoted to questions of phonology, syntax, style and vocabulary, suggested by Palladius but illustrated profusely from the whole field of Latin technical literature. As one might expect from the author of a

linguistic study on the Latin translations of Oribasius, the medical and veterinary authors take a prominent place, even the mediaeval *Antidotaria* being made to yield their share of evidence. But S. is equally at home with the writers on agriculture, architecture and cookery, and with a variety of non-technical works of popular character. In short, this book provides a mine of information about the types of Latin that, in greater or less degree, reveal the tendencies of everyday speech. Much of what S. has to say is not new; but for students of Late and Vulgar Latin who must delve for their information in a variety of journals and in dissertations that are sometimes hard to procure, it is a great advantage to have so large a mass of material collected and discussed in a volume equipped with copious indices and full references to relevant literature.

A few criticisms may be allowed on matters of detail. P. 109 ff.: no doubt S. is right in reading *Terentinas* for *Tarentinas* in 12, 13, 5; but questions as to the exact form of certain words employed by P. might with advantage be postponed until the evidence of all MSS. is available. Clearly a new edition of Palladius is required; and S. takes the first step by providing an *app. crit.* of the *Carmen* founded on eleven MSS. P. 124: for *cedra* compare the *credrae* of Petron. 38. P. 125: there is sometimes a vagueness in his treatment of phonology. Defending *aprotanum* for *abrotonum*, he says 'in abro- hat r das b tonlos gemacht'. This requires expan-

sion and illustration. P. 130: in the same paragraph with *herbum* = *ervum*, he mentions *verhex* = *vervex*, apparently regarding *b* in both cases as the spirant *ð*. Yet it is reasonably certain that, in the second instance anyhow, we are dealing, at some period, with a stop. P. 261: his explanation of *Iana Luna* in Varro *R.R. I* 37 as *initium lunae*, or 'Eingang zur Neuen Mondphase' (*iana* being a fem. form of *ianus*, 'Tor, Eingang', used as adj. (p. 637) = der den Eingang (Anfang) bildet), is ingenious, but does not convince me. P. 427: while we must allow *placenda* in Plaut. *Trin.* 1159 (to which might be added *pereunda* in *Epid.* 74) to be an active gerundive with 'Pflichtbedeutung', in the case of *Trin.* 264, *amor ignorandus* . . . *atque abstandus*, it is hardly permissible to state dogmatically that *abstandus* = *abstare debet*.

One is occasionally surprised at the author's readiness to enter upon dis-

cussions that seem to lie outside the normal boundaries of his subject. Thus, after dealing with the methods by which Palladius and other late writers express a date, he starts a long inquiry into the word *Kalendae*, deciding eventually that with this gerundive of *calo* the expression *novae lunae* was originally understood. He devotes several pages to *Explicit*, whose anomalous form he attributes to the analogy of *Incipit* or *Finit*. Under the heading of *tunc*, he writes a lengthy polemic against the theories of Lachmann and Housman about the inappropriateness of this word before a guttural or other consonant. Our author is a lavish host: my only complaint about generous fare is that it is apt to be reflected in the price of the meal.

I have no doubt that the reputation of Svennung, first established by *Orosiana* (1922), will be further increased by the present volume. J. W. PIRIE.

University of Glasgow.

#### THE LOEB AMMIANUS.

*Ammianus Marcellinus*. With an English translation by J. C. ROLFE. In three volumes. I. [Books XIV-XIX.] Pp. 1 + 583; portrait, 2 maps. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann, 1935. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.).

THIS is 'not a critical edition'. We must therefore not complain that the critical notes contain thirty-three mistakes,<sup>1</sup> of which ten are repeated from

C. U. Clark. But the shortcomings of Mr. Rolfe's work are not confined to the notes. Some of his renderings are remarkable. XIV. 2. 6: *firmare nisu ualido gressus*, 'take firm footing for a vigorous attack', but there is nothing about attack; *nisu ualido* is the opposite of *dubio nisu* in Sil. III. 632-3. 8. 7: *Commagena clementer adsurgit*, 'is gradually rising into power', but there is nothing about power; A. is treating of geography. 10. 5: *quod opera consulta cogitabatur astute*, 'this was thought to have been a shrewdly devised plan'. 11. 20: *obscurio iam die*, 'before dawn'. 11. 24: *illacrimoso*, 'lamentable'. XV. 4. 3: *horrore siluarum*, not, I think, 'dread of the forest'; cp. XV. 10. 1. 9. 7: *uarietas*, not 'discursiveness' but 'variety of opinion'. XVII. 1. 2: *moxque* is not 'and soon' but stands for *atque simulac*, just as *mox* stands for *simulac* at XIV. 10. 16. 5. 13: *placatae sint aurae inuidiae*, 'may envious ears be placated'. 13. 11: it might have been made clear that *meriti* is not nom. plur. but gen. sing. XVIII. 5. 7: *educatus in medio*, 'being brought forward'. 6. 12:

<sup>1</sup> For example, at XIV. 1. 10 *sibi opposita* was conjectured sixty years before Damsté by Langen; at 6. 8 *ipse* was never conjectured by Traube; at 6. 23 neither Lindenbrog nor anyone else ever conjectured *ut hac*; at 11. 11 the conjecture assigned to Clark was never made by him, and C. F. W. Mueller, *Neue Jahrb. f. Philol.* CVII, 1873, p. 341 conjectured not *adscisceret* but *adsciscet*; at XVII. 1. 7 *in* was added by Kellerbauer nearly forty years before Novák; at XIX. 1. 7 Thörnell, *Ad script. hist. Aug. et Amm. Marc. adnotat.* (Upsala, 1927), p. 10 conjectured not *domino suam* but *domino* alone; at 6. 7 Cornelissen, *Mnemosyne*, XIV, 1886, p. 303 conjectured not *inluni* but *interlunio*; at 7. 3 C. F. W. Mueller never conjectured *densetaeque*, but *densetaeque acie, op. cit.* p. 355. At XIV. 6. 25 part of a sentence from Valerius Maximus appears in the critical note with no indication of its origin or purpose.

in unum quaesiti complures, not 'uniting in pursuit of one man' but 'in one body'. 7. 5: *magnitudine culicum agitantur*, 'tormented by huge gnats'; but *m.c.* means the same as *culicum multitudine* in XXIV. 8. 3. XIX. 2. 13: *neutrubi proelio inclinato*, 'without a pause in the battle on either side'. 7. 3: *ferrea munimenta membrorum*, 'mail-clad siege-works'. 7. 8: *conspicior te gentium multitudine*, 'more conspicuous than the throng of his body-guard'. Other mistranslations occur at XIV. 2. 9; 6. 12; 7. 5; 9. 3; 11. 15; XV. 1. 4; 7. 3; 11. 17; XVI. 4. 3; 7. 2; 7. 5; 12. 11; 12. 14; XVII. 4. 6; 12. 20; 13. 20; XVIII. 3. 14; XIX. 11. 5. There are omissions at XIV. 6. 24; 8. 1; 11. 3; XVI. 2. 12; XVII. 10. 7; 13. 4.

Except in desperate passages the text does not differ very greatly from Clark's. It should differ more; where it does differ, it is generally for the better. In spite of the many critical notes, it must not be assumed that, where there is no note, there is manuscript authority for what is in the text; at XVIII. 8. 13, for example, *ciuitatem* is added by Cornelissen and not accepted by Clark.

I have noticed 208 misprints, of which 72 disfigure the text with such things as *laesi maiestatis, quid for quod, submissus for submissius, offerens for efferens*.

At XIV. 10. 14 Mr. Rolfe conjectures *Romanis*, but that was proposed long ago by O. Guenther, *Quaest. Ann. Crit.* (Göttingen, 1888), p. 11. At XV. 12. 4 it is misleading to mark the quotation from Cic. *Pro Font.* as '4. 8', for the words are found only in A. At XVI. 1. 5 the words from Cicero are not 'a very free quotation' from *De Orat.* III. 179, but an exact quotation from *Orat.* 147. At XVI. 10. 19 *mox* in the sense of *modo* is not to be defended by citing Col.

III. 20. 4, for there *de altero quod mox proposueram* answers *de eo quod primum proposuimus*.

On pp. 134 and 348 the Greek for 'cut' is κοπέω, for 'delicacies' μαρτία, for 'boil up' βράδευ; on p. 347 the nom. of σύπρυγας is σύπρυγαι and that of Sisichthona is Sisichthos; on p. 339 we hear of Iambilicus, on p. 185 of Itin. Burdigalensis. Whenever bene nummatus occurs Mr. Rolfe compares Horace; why not also the two passages of Cicero? On p. 71 Arabia becomes a province in 107. On p. 127 the same note occurs twice; on pp. 160, 349 the reader is sent to the Index fruitlessly. On p. xlv D is wrongly said to end at xxv. 4.

On p. xiii the account in XXIX. 1. 24 ff. is said to read 'like that of an eye-witness'; A.'s *uidimus* and *memoria* leave no room for doubt. Similarly unreasonable is the doubt implied on p. xvii in 'he also seems to have read Sallust'. Why it should be 'perhaps significant that he nowhere mentions either Tacitus or Livy' in his extant books I do not know. On p. xxi Mr. Rolfe quotes the statement that A. writes 'taciteisches Latein' and himself speaks of his imitation of Tacitus. I do not understand this. There are quotations and adaptations of Tacitus in A., but how can it be said that he is Tacitean in style, or even, except in a very few isolated sentences, shows any sign of trying to be?

Most of Mr. Rolfe's work is satisfactory and useful, more especially now that Clark's edition is out of print; but for that same reason one cannot help regretting that this edition is not the thoroughly reliable work of an expert in his author. G. B. A. FLETCHER.

University of Liverpool.

### THE LOEB SIDONIUS.

Sidonius: *Poems and Letters*. With an English translation, introduction, and notes, by W. B. ANDERSON. In two volumes. I. *Poems*; Letters, Books I-II. Pp. lxxv+483. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann, 1936. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.).

'THERE is still a great field for learned exertion in the works of this author', wrote Teuffel in 1873. It might almost seem as if the challenge had been at once taken up, for in 1887 and 1895 respectively appeared the two critical editions of Luetjohann in the *M.G.H.*



and of Mohr in the Teubner series which by sound scholarship did much to establish a good text of Sidonius. But even then the work was far from complete, as is admitted by Mohr in his preface (p. vii), 'non tam emendatoris indigere Sidonium quam interpretis in dies magis me perspexisse libere profiteor'. Professor Anderson has now made the authoritative translation, and the first volume of it, containing the Poems and the first two books of Epistles, has just been published in the Loeb series. Nothing so comprehensive and substantial has been done for the exegesis of Sidonius since the great Sirmond's edition of 1614.

To Sidonius with full justification might be applied Ben Jonson's cavalier dictum on Spenser, that 'in imitating the ancients he writ no language'. Believing himself a literary purist in a decadent age, he so elaborates every statement by outworn rhetorical devices, borrowed conceits, and verbal reminiscences of the classics, that his style is always exotic and at times desperately obscure. But he is our most precious evidence for the social and political history of the Western Empire in the fifth century: and so Professor Anderson has set himself a twofold task—to establish the meaning of his writings, and to use them in illuminating the dim background of the Gallo-Roman world. Hence the text has been translated with a scrupulous exactness which compels it to yield its full sense, and all points of special difficulty (such as abound in this author) are treated in numerous explanatory notes which almost amount to a systematic commentary. Hence, too, in a historical introduction the editor reconstructs the events of the period, sifting and interpreting the often meagre evidence with critical insight. To this is added an account of Sidonius' life and writings, with a review of the MS. sources and a most useful bibliography. By its perfection of plan and detail the book is not only pre-eminent in its series: it is the greatest contribution of modern scholarship to the study of Sidonius.

In a few passages I venture to

think that Sidonius' obscurity allows a second opinion:

(a) *Carm.* II. 140-1, *ludus erat puero raptas ex hoste sagittas | festina tractare manu*. I think that *festina* means not 'eager' but 'precocious', 'premature': cf. Claudian, X. 324-5 (of young Honorius), *vultus . . . auctura verendos | canities festina venit*; VIII. 370 *seqq.*, *laudanda petisti: | sed festinus amor: veniet robustior aetas*; Sil. Ital. II. 345-6, *nec vero terrent puerilia protinus ora | sub galea et pressae properata casside malae*.

(b) *Carm.* XI. III-2, *pendens rota sulcat inanem | aera et in liquido non solvitur orbita tractu*. I feel that the sense of *non solvitur* is exactly the same as that of *durant* in Stat. *Theb.* VI. 363 *seqq.* (Apollo), *radiante per aethera saltu . . . venit; . . . ipse olim in terris, caelo vestigia durant, claraque per Zephyros etiam nunc semita lucet*. The opposite sense is expressed by *perit* in Stat. *Ach.* I. 236, *liquido perit orbita ponto*.

(c) *Carm.* XV. 65-6, *Lunam sic orbe supremo | ter denas tropico prope currere climate myras*. The editor's statement 'had Sidonius been speaking of the sun, there would have been no difficulty' requires a certain qualification. *ter denas . . . currere myras*, whether applied to the moon, the sun or any of the five planets, is a meaningless phrase—unless some idea of time is introduced. E.g., Saturn traverses 30° of the Zodiacal circle in about 2½ years, the sun in a year, and the moon in 2½ days (approximately). When Sidonius, without any indication of time, says that the moon traverses *ter denas myras*, the most complimentary explanation is to assume that he has confused the 30 days of the moon's synodic revolution with the 30° of the Zodiac through which the sun passes in 30 days.

(d) *Carm.* XXII. 45-6, *sensim captivo umore refusus | sponte refrondescit per bracchia roscida palmes*. What is the meaning of *refusus*? The river-god Ganges, as prisoner of Bacchus, has his hands tied behind his back by a vine-tendril; l. 44, *coniectas in vincla manus post terga revinxit | pampinus*. *Refusus* appears to mean that this knotted vine

unc-  
cap-  
ang-  
imp-  
'sp-  
tae-  
in-  
sen-  
59,  
rela-  
Chi-  
equ-  
(a)  
Dun-  
mea-  
poo-  
irrig-  
the  
and  
the  
para-  
and  
(l. 1  
Aen-  
.  
pulo-  
(J)  
per  
fluct-  
Sido-  
com-  
at t-  
off h-  
  
Hist-  
C.  
C.  
(C  
C.  
At  
ends  
Asty-  
stud-  
laym-  
has  
the  
the  
brac-  
the v-  
recon-  
ates  
whic-  
phon-

uncoils and spreads out behind the captive river-god. Cf. V.F. V. 254-6, *anguis . . . spiris nemus omne refusis implicuit*, where Burman's note is: '*spirae refusae* possunt explicari "*laxatae*" "in longum expansae" quae antea in orbem contractae sunt'. Is this sense not also required at *Carm.* XI. 59, (*matris*) *somno refusae*, 'lying back, relaxed in sleep'? Cf. Claudian IX. 6, Chiron *molliter obliqua parte refusus equi*, 'luxuriously sprawling back'.

(e) *Carm.* XXII. 103, *exis curvata, Durani muscose, saburra*. Does not this mean 'Duranius, that risest in a sandy pool'? The phrase will then balance *irrigua rupe Garunna* (l. 101), so that the source of each river is described and contrasted—just as the speed of the two rivers is described in the two parallel phrases *rotate Garunna* (l. 101) and *simili festinus . . . lapsu, Durani* (l. 102). *Exire* is then used as in *Virg. Aen.* VIII. 74-5, *quo te cumque lacus . . . fonte tenet, quocumque solo pulcherrimus exis*.

(f) *Epist.* II. 2. 17, (*fluvius*) *coactus per cola subterranea deliquari non ut fluctibus, sed ut piscibus pauperetur*. Sidonius' lake is fed by a stream which comes tumbling down a rocky declivity at the upper end and which is drained off by subterranean pipes at the lower

end. The fish, being able neither to leap the rapids on the one side nor to wriggle through the pipes at the other side, return to the calm waters in the middle of the lake (*repulsi in gurgitem pigriorem*), where they thrive and fatten (*carnes rubras albis abdominibus extendunt*; cp. Auson. *Mosella* 104-5). By a characteristically feeble conceit he imagines their bulk as creating a portable prison for them (*ita illis nec redire valentibus nec exire permissis quendam vivum et circumlaticium carcerem corpulentia facit*). Like Horace's *volpecula*, they are boxed in by their size. Here I feel that Sidonius' style makes the passage seem more difficult than it is: as so often in this letter, he is more concerned to embellish his description than to write clearly.

(g) *Epist.* II. 12. 2, *salubriter cedat ipsa vegetatio*. The sense of *vegetatio* is surely 'bracing, tonic effect', as would appear from such a passage as *Firm. Matern.* I. 7. 16 (a description of Plotinus, who, to safeguard himself from the attacks of Fortune, provided for his health by settling in Campania), *ubi semper aëris quieta moderatio cunctos incolas salubri vegetatione sustentat*.

W. H. SEMPLE.

University of Reading.

### EARLY IRAN.

*History of Early Iran*, by George G. CAMERON. Pp. xvi+260; 1 map. Chicago: University of Chicago Press (Cambridge: University Press), 1936. Cloth, 13s. 6d.

AT first sight a *History of Iran* which ends with the victory of Cyrus over Astyages has little to offer to classical students. But what must impress the layman is not only the progress that has been made in the reconstruction of the political history, at all events, of the great mountain-belt which embraces the Mesopotamian lowlands, but the vivid way in which the history, so reconstructed, anticipates and illuminates the glimpses of these countries which we have in Herodotus, in Xenophon's *Anabasis*, and in Arrian.

Dr. Cameron gives us little but tribal and dynastic doings; raids, conquests, collapses as rapid as the empire-building which they terminate. But these details, like a slow-motion film, are articulate; and the story was not over when Loftus travelled in the 'fifties' (p. 197). They are also the other side of the story as we are familiar with it in histories of Babylonia and Assyria. Those 'enemy sources' contribute indeed very much; but the wealth and historical content of Elamite documents, in particular, are considerable; and enough is becoming known of this difficult country to enable Dr. Cameron to present at least an intelligible sketch-map. We could wish he had included more of the principal names from his text, and

especially a few more modern names as pointers.

Even in so strictly political a narrative, however, cultural details flash out here and there: the climax of Elamite architecture in the thirteenth century, with its 'architects' plans', bronze site-model, and immense castings (pp. 123-8), its creators' searches for rare timber-trees in the remoter glens (p. 106), and the vivid amazement of Assurbanipal's looters at this 'Forbidden Palace' (p. 205). Another striking incident is the Assyrian hunger for horses—we remember our own in the Boer War—and the early recurrence of the famous white breed of Nisa, which survived to delight Xerxes (p. 171).

In a short introduction Dr. Cameron has set the whole pageant of early Iran on its geographical and ethnic stage; so that later recrudescence of what he calls 'Caucasian' peoples, languages, and customs is eloquent of age-long struggle with successive periods of in-

gress, from Gutium, from the home of the Kassites, from the remoter home of the Indo-Iranians. To take a classical example—when Cambyses wanted to marry his sister, there was no need for the Royal Judges to rely on infallible kingship; it was good 'Caucasian' custom—if they had known—and one would like to hear what was said about the match in the highlands.

Even before the last chapter, Herodotus' account of the Median kingdom brings us within our depth; the political events which lead to the Fall of Nineveh receive welcome illustrations; and while Ctesias, like Egyptian priests, 'does not always lie', it is Herodotus 'whose veracity we are seldom able to question' (p. 226); while Ezekiel, Jeremiah, and the 'would-be prophet' of Isaiah ch. xiii, whose Median Peril was a nightmare (pp. 222-3), find their place in the foreground of this fascinating *History of Iran*. J. L. MYRES.

Oxford.

#### THE ERYTHRAE DECREE.

*The Erythrae Decree.* Contributions to the early history of the Delian League and the Peloponnesian Confederacy. By Leo Ingemann HIGHBY. Pp. viii + 107. (Klio, Beiheft 36.) Leipzig: Dieterich, 1936. Paper, RM. 6.50 (bound, 8).

APART from the brief summary given by Thucydides, the Erythrae decree, C.I.G. 1<sup>2</sup>, 10, is our most important evidence for the relation of Athens to the allies in the early period of the Delian League. The decree is preserved only through a copy which is now lost, and it is clear that the copyist found the stone difficult to decipher. His text needs manipulation before it makes sense, and, unless the stone itself is refound, there must always remain a considerable margin of error in restoration. In spite of this the general sense of the majority of the clauses is reasonably clear, and the evidence they afford is important. Their interpretation, however, demands caution. Many historians have seized on the religious obligations and democratic forms of government imposed by Athens and ignored the emphasis laid on the Medes and on

the allies. The document must be considered as a whole in its proper setting before use is made of its parts. This Mr. Highby has done, and, on the whole, done very well.

He begins with a reconsideration of the text. The decree was inscribed stoichedon, with lines of 47 letters, and can and should be restored to fit this requirement. The fragment C.I.G. 1<sup>2</sup>, 12/13a, in Athens, preserves part of the conclusion of the decree. A proper understanding of the various provisions reveals friendly relations between Athens and Erythrae. The decree in fact does not follow a revolt, but marks the first entry of Erythrae into the League, following the expulsion of pro-Persian tyrants. Local Erythraean inscriptions are not inconsistent with this view, and the letter-forms of our decree are similar to the Thasian casualty list (C.I.G. 1<sup>2</sup>, 928) and point to a date in the middle sixties or slightly earlier.

The main criticism of this chapter must be that it has too little contact with actual inscriptions. A 47-letter line is an attractive basis for restoration, but Mr. Highby's text rides rough-



shod over the copyist's version. L. 9 has twelve letters where the copyist has fifteen; L. 8 has eighteen letters where the copyist gives fourteen and no gaps. In l. 4 the extra letters which the copy suggests at the end of the line are ignored. Not only is the copyist, who was certainly careless, treated with contempt: the engraver also is made one of the most careless workers of the century. In l. 14 he drops five letters. He is a constant victim of haplography and homoeoteleuton. In l. 6 he leaves two vacant spaces before beginning a new clause, though his normal practice is to run straight on. Even where the 47-letter line is thought to be most secure (l. 20 sq.) the restoration is very debatable. The new text needs far more explanation than we are offered. These criticisms would lose much of their weight if it could be proved that the fragment 12/13a belonged originally to the same stone. The stoichedon arrangement is there plain, and the 47-letter line restoration is convincing. But this in turn raises another problem which has not been faced. If our decree marks the opening of relations between Athens and Erythrae, it must come before I.G. I<sup>2</sup>, 11 (in London) and 12/13b (in Athens). The letter-forms in 12/13b appear to the reviewer earlier than in a. The problem should at any rate be studied. Mr. Highby has also made his argument from letter-forms too easy. All the forms of 10 can be found in the fifties, and the angular beta appears as late as the tribute list of 449. It is very difficult to believe with Mr. Highby that 12/13a and 928 are contemporaries. But, though this section suggests the library rather than the museum, several of the new readings are an improvement on previous texts—notably the opening of the decree and the restorations of ll. 15 and 16.

The main strength of the thesis lies in the second chapter, which sets out to show that the new interpretation of the decree is consistent with what is known of the earlier history of the League. Mr. Highby adopts a compromise between the views of Kirchhoff

and Leo and argues his case extremely persuasively. When Herodotus says οὕτω δὴ τὸ δεύτερον Ἰωνίῃ ἀπὸ Περσέων ἀπέστη he means Ionia and not the whole seaboard. Myrina and Gryneion were given to Gongylus, and Aeolis as a whole probably held aloof. The inscriptional evidence of a yearly festival at Lampsacus in honour of Themistocles shows that the Persians had more than a nominal control over the town when Themistocles received it. It is probable then that many towns, including Erythrae, did not come into the League until the great offensive which began with the Eurymedon and was continued in the Hellespontine district. This view about Lampsacus and Myus, however, surely demands that Themistocles went to Xerxes rather than to his successor. That is difficult. Even Plutarch, who prefers a good story to good chronology, found the balance of evidence against Ephorus.

The third chapter refutes Schaefer's view that the Hellenic League of 481 was not dissolved until 462/1, and that the Delian League was merely a matter of the transfer of the 'agonal' hegemony. Finally Mr. Highby discusses some questions in the chronology of the early Pentecontaetia. Leotychides' Thessalian expedition is set in 469; 471/0 is the date of Themistocles' condemnation rather than of his ostracism.

The last two chapters contain useful material, but are not related to the Erythrae decree. Schaefer's view hardly deserves such serious consideration, and the points of chronology might be argued elsewhere. It would have been better to use the space to strengthen the first two chapters. For it is there that Mr. Highby has something new and important to say. We do not think that his case is conclusive. It is still possible to believe that Erythrae was already an ally, and that Athens interfered to secure her from a Medizing party. But whether Mr. Highby is right or wrong, he has made a real contribution to the study of the Delian League.

R. MEIGGS.

Keble College, Oxford.

## GREECE FROM 479 TO 323 B.C.

M. L. W. LAISTNER: *A History of the Greek World from 479 to 323 B.C.* (Methuen's History of the Greek and Roman World, II.) Pp. xv + 492; 4 maps. London: Methuen, 1936. Cloth, 15s.

PROFESSOR LAISTNER'S volume has much the same qualities as its successor, Dr. Cary's *History of the Greek World from 323 to 146*. It collects a great deal of information into a compact mass; it is (on the whole) very accurate, the narrative concise and dry (on art, letters and philosophy, very dry); it is up to date. It is divided into two parts: one, the political events (322 pages), and two, a series of chapters on warfare, government, economic life, art, literature, philosophy, and religion: all neatly classified and docketed. This not only has the disadvantage, perhaps unavoidable, of separating art, letters and religion too precisely from public life, but we are asked to learn about actual wars and politics before we know anything of methods of warfare and government. Professor Laistner is himself sometimes misled by this: for example, the failure of Athens to aid Plataea in 431-427, which he can explain only by the pestilence and financial difficulties, is in part explicable from his own chapter on warfare; and his incorrect statement on p. 104 that the Athenians at Delium had 20,000 *light-armed infantry* is in part corrected on pp. 328-9 and 335.

When he expresses his own judgement on events, I often find myself in agreement with him (particularly on the peace of 386, Epaminondas, Dionysius I, and the supposed decadence of Greece in the fourth century); but not always. To speak of the comparative political stability of the Greek world before the Peloponnesian War seems to me as idle as the recent statement that at no time were the relations between England and Germany more friendly than in 1914. The Athenian empire is to be condemned 'because it lacked organic unity and because it was essentially a selfish creation which never developed into something better'; but what empire has not been selfish at least in its beginning? What chance did this one

have of developing at all? Did it not lack organic unity just in so far as it was unselfish (in practice, if not in intention), that is, as it left the subject states as separate units (as Rome did not)? The second Delian League was more 'unselfish', and so had even less unity and fell to pieces without the necessity of external attack. When Professor Laistner says that the march of the Ten Thousand showed the Greeks, amongst other things, the superiority of a professional army over the ordinary citizen militia, he makes an interesting but, I think, a misleading statement. The Ten Thousand did not form a professional *army*, but were a chance collection of men most of whom had had much experience of war in the several militia forces, a very different thing. Their achievement, after the loss of their officers, is essentially similar to Marathon and Plataea: that is, it showed the normal efficiency of the hoplite against Asiatic troops and also that surprising power of self-discipline of which the Greeks, in the midst of all their indiscipline, gave on occasion such conspicuous examples.

There are some errors and omissions. The Peace of Callias once more: 'It is in the highest degree improbable that the ruler of the Persian empire gave any such undertaking' as to keep his warships out of the Aegean. How then explain Thuc. viii 56. 4? Why not assume, as Vlachos has done in his recent book, a mutual undertaking not to send warships into the other's zone?

Laistner follows Aristotle in holding that it was the Areopagus that kept its head in the emergency before Salamis; but in that case he should have noted that he does not follow Aristotle consistently, for the latter says the generals lost theirs. When he says that 'many civil cases, especially commercial litigation, were tried in Athenian courts' at the time of the empire, he should at least have mentioned the agreement with Phaselis, which is on a basis of equality for both states. There cannot have been disfranchisement of 'the so-called *μητρό-ξενον*' by the law of 451, as the case of Cimon, mentioned by Laistner in the

same sentence, proves. He writes: 'the most recent estimate of the Athenian population (in 431) . . . suggests about 43,000 adult male citizens and a total citizen body—allowing two children to each married couple—of 172,000', with a reference to my book; but I must protest that I do not 'allow two children to each married couple'. To say that re-election to office, in Athens, was forbidden except in those offices 'which, like the strategia, were military in character', is misleading: re-election was possible in all cases in which election was by vote, and these were offices which were *technical* in character (engineers, architects, as well as generals, and, as well, ambassadors). So is the statement that 'litigants were able to submit their case to a public arbitrator'. Metics were not, as far as we know, obliged to act through citizen sponsors 'in most cases of litigation'; and 'the status of the liberated slave' was not 'like' that of the metic—he was a metic if he stayed in Athens. Metic farmers need not have been hired workmen: they could rent farms, as they could houses. That there was no scientific agriculture in the fourth century may be true; but it seems inconsistent with the improvements introduced into Egyptian agriculture by the earliest Greek settlers under the Ptolemies.

In his account of constitutional changes at Athens in the fourth century, Laistner properly emphasizes the change in the activities of the strategoi, and points out that the leading members of the assembly were 'politicians first and last'. But he then goes on to say that these latter often held for long periods important financial posts. If this were so, the change could only have been for the better. The real weakness of the fourth century was that so many leaders of the assembly held no office, and so were irresponsible. When Laistner says that in the same century the ecclesia was dominated by urban voters belonging to the poorest classes, and 'what in theory was government by the sovereign people, in reality was rule by a class for a class', we naturally ask, why did such an ecclesia so frequently hesitate to authorize military expeditions, which would involve

personal and financial sacrifice mostly from the classes it was oppressing?

There is no social history in this volume, except brief hints under industry and commerce. In the account of the Mysteries of Eleusis, nothing is said of their non-political character (slave and free, foreigner and citizen being all equally eligible for initiation). The maps are poor; and two of them face the wrong way. I doubt the judgement of a historian who regards as 'a fantastic legend' the statement that the palace at Persepolis was burnt by accident, and thinks it impossible that Demosthenes or Aeschines could be guilty of the 'infantile mistake' of calling the Boeotian assembly meeting at Thebes 'the Theban assembly'.

More important than all these is the fact that in his account of the Athenian constitution Laistner, like Aristotle in the *Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία*, gives the details but omits the explanation. Neither in his narrative of events from 507 to 462 nor in his special chapter does he explain how the dominant position of the Assembly was secured against both the Areopagus and the Boulê of 500. Normally a committee of any society, with all the administration in their hands, will in fact have most of the power, whatever the paper constitution may say. Why did not the Areopagus develop as the Roman Senate did? Why did not the Boulê get some of the power of a parliament? And why, on the other hand, was this subordinate Boulê regarded by the Athenians as the keystone of the democracy, so that it was its overthrow by the Four Hundred and by the Thirty that marked the triumph of oligarchy? Such questions Professor Laistner has not even asked, let alone answered.

For this reason, and because he has made so marked a separation of narrative of events from accounts of government, trade and intellectual activities (their combination is admittedly a difficult problem), this book is an admirable work of reference, and will long remain so, but not a history. I may add that the division of Greek History in the year 323 seems more faulty than ever. A. W. GOMME.

*University of Glasgow.*

## THE ROMAN REPUBLIC.

H. W. HOUSEHOLD: *Rome, Republic and Empire*. Vol. i: *The Republic*. Pp. xii+308; 3 maps. London: Dent, 1936. Cloth, 3s. 6d.

THIS is the first of two volumes designed as complement to the author's two on *Hellas the Forerunner*. The work is avowedly 'popular'—not for Classical Sides—but it may be said at once that it deserves commendation from those who teach the classics as a systematic discipline: it would not be easy to find a more attractive text-book for introduction to Ancient History. The writing is lucid, simple, and sententious with the kind of *sententiae* that should provoke the young reader to think. Two points will indicate its proportion and method: first, the fact that rather more than half of a book which ends with the death of Caesar is devoted to the period down to the Second Punic War; and second, the copious quotations from Livy (with several from Plutarch and from Horace's 'patriotic' odes). The author has thus been at pains to make clear the key of the Roman tradition, as it was set in the 'heroic' age of Rome in her small Italian world, and above all in the supreme crisis of the struggle with Hannibal.

At the same time, the proportion between earlier and later which has been thus chosen may be misleading unless the book is used merely as an introduction. Thus three pages on the revolt of the Carthaginian mercenaries—interesting, but not directly relevant—are a large allowance in comparison with the half-dozen lines on Carthage; and one looks in vain for any clear account of what a Roman 'province' was, or how its governor was appointed, so that the statement of the issue between Caesar and the Senate is hardly intelligible—though every teacher knows the difficulty of satisfying both his pupils and himself on this question. Still, on the whole, the sometimes arbitrary and capricious choice of matters for emphasis justifies itself in maintaining interest and stimulating curiosity.

A few details may be noted. On early customs and religion, too much use is made of the theory of an Egyptian origin for Italian and all other civilization, which is hardly pabulum for beginners—the whole doctrine of the 'Children of the Sun' and their *diaspora*. On p. 27 there seems to be a confusion, or identification, of the curiate and the centuriate system of division, which leaves them both unintelligible. P. 46: the *dies Alliensis* was July 18th, not 16th. P. 48: does *Vols-cium* ever occur? P. 119: Hannibal's birth is dated 249 B.C.; but Polybius says he was only nine when his father took him to Spain, which was not earlier than 237. P. 154: his veterans were not 'in the front line' at Zama, but in the third, almost in reserve. P. 158: the 'expulsions' of Latins from Rome in 187 and 177 were not 'harsh measures that bore hardly on the allies': they were carried out at the request of the Latin towns themselves. P. 223: Marius's camp on the Rhône (in spite of Mommsen) cannot have been so far north as the confluence of the Isère; and it is not the fact that no barbarian invasion passed the Alps for 'five hundred years' after Vercellae—it was less than 300 till the siege of Aquileia by the Marcomanni (in A.D. 166), not to mention Aurelian's battles at Placentia and Pavia in 270. P. 224: the statement that Saturninus reduced the price of the corn-distributions to 'a merely nominal figure' should be corrected by Professor Last's convincing reading *senis* (for the vulgate *semissibus*) *et trientibus* (was it *senis assibus et trientibus*?). P. 229: Sulla was consul in 88 B.C., not with Strabo in 89. P. 235: he marched north (from before Praeneste) to fight the battle of the Colline Gate—not 'south' (from Etruria). P. 250: the narrative of the Mithridatic war of 87-86 B.C. omits the part played by the army of Flaccus and Fimbria. P. 253: did Pompey in 62 desire a second consulship, and did the Senate refuse it? P. 259: Caesar's election as Pontifex Maximus is apparently placed *after* the Catilinarian outbreak in 63. P. 264:



where in Cicero's Letters do we learn that Terentia was 'a difficult lady who liked to have her say about affairs of state'? P. 294: the legion with which Caesar crossed the Rubicon was the 13th, not the 6th.

It will, however, be observed that most of these are quite small matters: Mr. Household's general standard of accuracy in points of fact is high.

A. F. GILES.

University of Edinburgh.

### AUGUSTUS.

Wilhelm WEBER: *Princeps: Studien zur Geschichte des Augustus*. Band I. Pp. vii+240+265\*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1936. Paper, RM. 24.

PROFESSOR WEBER explains in his Preface that having conceived the idea of a History of Monarchy he was induced to publish a separate study of the Roman *Princeps*, and that it seemed to him necessary that this study should begin with a new interpretation of the *Res Gestae Divi Augusti*, as indispensable for understanding the *Princeps* as a type, or the 'enigmatic personality' of the creator of that type. This interpretation is contained in the present volume. The second volume, in which there will be *die Darstellung des Princeps selbst*, is to appear next September on the birthday of Augustus.

Volume I consists of three chapters and a rich accumulation of notes. In Chapter I (*Der Sommer 14 n. Chr.*) it is argued that Augustus in the three months before his death, believing his end to be very near, was preparing for it in secret, and arranging for a peaceful transmission of his *optimus status rei publicae* to the charge of Tiberius, and so came cheerfully to an impressive euthanasia. (Here Velleius and Suetonius are preferred to the *Meister Tacitus*.) In Chapter II (*Der Tote*) the events of the month after the death of Augustus are examined in detail: the *geheime Regie* of those who had stood nearest to him carried out his plans smoothly, keeping men's minds at Rome under the influence of the dead, till the man whom by adoption he had recommended to the State for the Principate was 'freely' chosen to succeed him. Here are reviewed the *testamentum* (in effect, another recommendation of Tiberius); the *breviarium imperii* (a *Rechenschaftsbericht über den status feli-*

*cissimus rei publicae*); the political precepts recorded by Dio (a coherent but too static idea of a Roman People dominant, within fixed frontiers, over subject populations, and governed by its *illustres*, of whom the *princeps*, it is implied, is the chosen *optimus*—though on this last point Professor Weber has to treat Dio's words with a high hand); and the *funus* and *consecratio* (the latter influenced by the *Romuluslegende*—a recognition that Augustus had saved and rebuilt the State, and an expression of the will that the *novus status* should continue).

Chapter III, on the *Res Gestae*, makes up, with its appendant notes, more than half the book. It is strongly urged that this document is no patchwork, but that a close examination of its order and verbal arrangement, of the meanings with which it is charged, and the distribution of its references (p. 234), reveals a unity, a work of art, powerfully wrought by Augustus, a few weeks before his death, to be his own Mythos, the Mythos of the new god, but a god who had merited the honours of divinity by the incomparable magnitude and moderation of his rational human action, by his human virtues and unique disinterested human services to his people, of whose liberty and traditions he had been the champion and guardian, guiding it into a new age by his *auctoritas* (the ultimate source of his power), a Periclean *Führer*. And Augustus represented this (in an imaginative logical order) concretely by a record of certain of his acts, and as mirrored in extraordinary honours offered to him by Senate and People—a Mythos without miracles, without signs of heavenly interference with the free choice of the Roman community, but *hac arte Pollux*. . . . After all, his

*auctoritas*, which he mentions without explanation, was it not for him the *Urkraft* of the divine Julian blood?

In this chapter and its notes the reader will find, with an interpretation of the *Res Gestae* section by section, the detailed results of Professor Weber's wonderfully thorough work on the Latin and Greek texts. He believes that the Greek translator was no bungler and no provincial underling, but that where he has been blamed for some gross mistake, either the fault is with a copying-clerk or stonecutter, or there is no mistake, but a justifiable attempt to bring out the meaning of the Latin (so in *RG* 8, 5): the translator did his work faithfully and understandingly; he was a Greek who knew Rome; probably he was an official in Caesar's household, familiar with the mind of Augustus.

Of the notes on other than textual points the following may be mentioned: nn. 135 (*status rei publicae*); 158, 164, 622 (conceptions of monarchy); 170-8 (end of Agrippa Postumus); 244-74 (*legata* of Augustus to *populus* and *militēs*); 383-443, 680 (*consecratio* and cult of Augustus); 550-73 (*RG* 1 and 2); 599 (*cura legum et morum*); 611 (*princeps as exemplar*); 624 (*RG* 15; *manubiae* and *patrimonium* as sources of Augustan benefactions); 664-6 (*RG* 26,

1-4); 671 (*RG* 27, 3); 672 (colonies in provinces); 673 (lost *signa militaria*).

This important and interesting book is not easy reading, with its copious text and crowded notes. To keep up with the author's enthusiasm for the *Res Gestae* as a work of art may be found difficult; and the reader may rather often feel reluctant to go all the way with Professor Weber's arguments. He says of his own construction, 'Es wird manchen befremden'. But as to what the *Index Rerum Gestarum* was meant to be, it was surely meant to set forth what Augustus wished the Roman People, after his death, to admire him for having done and having been as a power in the Roman *civitas*; and as he no doubt wished to be honoured, after his death, as a god of the Roman community on account of what he had done and been for it in his lifetime, there seems to be no harm in calling the *Res Gestae* 'The Mythos of the new god'. On which Professor Weber would perhaps observe, 'Aber das Ganze ist unerreicht in seinem Umfang bei ähnlich knappen Sätzen und schlichtem Referat' (n. 445). There can be no doubt, at any rate, that this is a very remarkable work, and the second volume of *Princeps* is something to look forward to.

C. G. STONE.

#### ANTONY.

Jack LINDSAY: *Marc Antony. His World and his Contemporaries*. Pp. xii + 330; 13 plates. London: Routledge, 1936. Cloth, 15s.

THE fifty years or so of the life of M. Antonius, the most exciting period of Roman history, clamour again and again to be retold and reinterpreted. Mr. Lindsay portrays for us not one life but the whole revolutionary age. Only one-third of the book is left for the career of Antonius when Antonius mattered, after the assassination of Caesar the Dictator: and here the full years of Roman politics, especially 44 and 43 B.C. with all their contemporary evidence, are narrowly compressed. Egypt's Queen and eastern religious

movements command the centre of interest.

Much of the historical evidence is frankly partisan—or just mere invective. Hence the fresh approach of a robust and anti-suggestible character like Mr. Lindsay and his attempt to rescue history from 'professors and other simple-minded people' can only be welcomed. To say that the book should be read with caution is no depreciation—for this is creative work, not a paraphrase of the vulgate. Mr. Lindsay's Catiline is too good to be true: yet not perhaps as misleading as Cicero's monster. Further, he makes out a credible and attractive Curio. With Antonius, however, a paradox. The rehabilitator has

not been ruthless enough: he has left too many old clothes on the traditional dummy. In short, he has not made sufficient allowance for the propaganda of the victors. Antonius degenerates to a case of sexual psychopathology (see especially pp. 286 and 291).

This brings one to the essential weakness of Mr. Lindsay's book. When describing men in speech and action, his narrative is clean and vigorous; his accounts of the senatorial debates of 50 B.C., for example, or of Antonius' invasion of Media are splendid. Here he is a historian, and a good one. But Marx and Freud are ever lurking round the corner, sinister and fraternal. When they enter, they bring ruin and nonsense.

'Caesar stood at the head of a movement which sought to actualize as much of internationalizing brotherhood as his epoch was capable of actualizing with its slight productive machinery' (p. xi). These abstract words are alarming enough in a historian. More horrid the other mysticism. 'To Antonius the rôle of Dionysos uttered itself in the world-storming emotions of drunkenness, when actuality melts wet-clay to masterly sculpture fingers, when all food-problems (and therefore all the problems of earth) are lost in a fermentation of the senses returning deep to earliest womb-memories' (p. 234).

RONALD SYME.

Trinity College, Oxford.

### CRIMINAL LAW UNDER TIBERIUS.

Robert Samuel ROGERS: *Criminal Trials and Criminal Legislation under Tiberius*. Pp. x+216. Middletown, Conn.: The American Philological Association, 1935. Cloth.

THIS book is one which, though it will appeal specially to those who are interested in the reign of Tiberius and in the developments that took place both in the meaning of *maiestas* and in the use of charges of *maiestas*, should not be neglected by those who are making a broader study of the Empire. For some years past Professor Rogers has published papers upon various topics and incidents in Tiberius' principate, and in this volume the reader will find set out an account of every criminal trial that took place during the principate, with a careful analysis of the evidence. The enumeration is (as far as I can tell) complete, and Professor Rogers has even included *ex abundantia cautela* an item such as the alleged driving to suicide of the grammarian Seleucus (Suet. *Tib.* 56), which can hardly have involved a criminal trial; still, it is better to be safe. Indexes and analytical tables complete an exceptionally thorough book.

Considering the great importance that trials for *maiestas* assumed under Tiberius, a careful study of this book will be essential for anyone who wishes to write about the reign or express a

verdict upon Tiberius. It deserves and should receive the compliment of a full and searching review; here I need only indicate general approval of it without going into detail for which there is no room and which would only interest 'specialists' (*servum pecus*). Rogers shows for many trials the extreme doubtfulness of much of the evidence, e.g. for Aelius Saturninus (p. 73); he gives an extraordinarily good analysis of all the cases, and he clears Tiberius of much of the reputation for cruelty or injustice which Tacitus and Suetonius have hung about him. (On page 112, by the way, the word 'intended' should be inserted before the word 'attack'.) But I cannot help feeling that his general verdict on Tiberius (as given on page 205) is a little too kindly. On page 195 he remarks with justice: 'There remain, however, the astonishing figures that indictments for *maiestas* numbered more than a hundred and comprise more than one half of the recorded indictments (named or unnamed) brought against identified persons'. That is very true, and when I recollect that these 'more than a hundred' indictments were crowded into a reign of only twenty-three years the impression on me becomes overwhelming that something was very wrong indeed with the administration, and that Tiberius cannot be absolved from blame for that,

though he may be relieved of calumny. But on that question everyone must make up his own mind, and to do that with knowledge and justice he will have

to read and work over this valuable book.

M. P. CHARLESWORTH.

*St. John's College, Cambridge.*

### DOMINUS ET DEUS.

Kenneth SCOTT: *The Imperial Cult under the Flavians*. Pp. 204. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1936. Paper, RM. 9.

PORTENTS tremendous and trivial heralded the future of the Flavian House. Out of Judaea was to come a King of the World; and in Arcadia excavations conducted under inspired guidance unearthed sacred vessels of venerable antiquity bearing the image of Vespasian—it cannot have required a great effort of faith to discern those plebeian and battered features upon a piece of long-buried metal-work. Announced and founded by divine favour, the rule of the Flavians exploited religious formulae and religious sentiment—for now that the Empire was firmly established we can speak of policy rather than of improvisation. The period witnessed further developments such as the worship of the *Gens Flavia* and the intensification of the imperial cult provoked by the conscious and consequent absolutism of Domitian.

In the last generation an enormous accession of new material and a more sympathetic interpretation have enabled scholarship to atone for its earlier neglect of the profane cults of the Hellenistic and Roman world. There are two methods of study, the intuitive, sometimes degenerating into a mystical welter in which the prophet and his god can hardly be distinguished, and the analytical, which by its nature is more prosaic. Professor Scott has chosen the second approach. The subject is large, the evidence varied, abundant and converging—the poets and the coins supplement each other in an admirable and a convincing fashion. It has clearly been an attractive task to sort it all out and fit it together. After many years of preparation and numerous periodical articles on points of detail Professor Scott has acquitted himself faithfully and well.

To be sure, one sometimes gets a little tired of 'Kaiserkult', of the iteration of monotonous evidence about matters that few have cared to doubt or to prove. Scott has been unfortunate in that some of his work has been anticipated by two volumes in the same series, the *Studien zu Martial* of the learned and ingenious Weinreich, the master of the Tübingen School, and the exhaustive and sometimes exhausting researches of Sauter (*Der römische Kaiserkult bei Martial und Statius*, 1934). Instances of the influence of the divine *numen* of the Emperor upon animals (see Weinreich, 143 ff., and Dölger on the 'sacred fish' of Domitian, *Antike u. Christentum* I (1929), 167 ff.) illustrated by prose translations of Martial's *Liber Spectaculorum* do not make exhilarating reading. The profane become sceptical about the point and value of such learning.

What matters most, I suppose, is this—what did it all mean? how much is convention, propaganda and formula, how much genuine religious sentiment? These are large questions. Scott does not solve them—but then he has not set out to: his purpose is to provide the material, in a rational arrangement. For this we must be warmly thankful.

The researches of Scott illumine many topics connected with the literature, the history, and the coinage of the Flavian period. To take a few examples: he gives a full list of the portents of the year 69 and shows, from the cessation of such manifestations after the triumph of the Flavian cause, how much in them was pure propaganda.—Yet here, quoting Tacitus (*Hist.* I, 10) in an English translation, he says, 'Tacitus, a contemporary, was convinced of the existence of divine manifestations of future greatness for the Flavians' (p. 3). This is unfair to the Roman historian, who is here his own ironical self—'post fortunam credi-

dimu  
of a  
Vesp  
form  
yet  
argu  
ally

ibit in  
et sor

Why  
secre  
not t  
a me  
matte  
there  
proem  
Flaco  
prese  
seriou  
Getty  
date  
cult i  
impor  
espec  
nensis  
repro  
cated  
Trials  
featur  
Here  
little  
impor  
have  
the c  
was  
of the

H. M.  
Em  
III  
640  
Mu  
IN th  
Mr M  
the h  
volum  
compl  
the M  
the p  
This  
of St  
prägu  
trate  
NO.



dimus.'—Coins were struck in honour of a 'Diva Domitilla': who is she—Vespasian's wife or his daughter? The former, so Dessau and Mattingly held: yet Scott (p. 48) is probably right in arguing for the daughter; see especially Statius, *Silvae* I, 1, 97 f.,

ibit in amplexus natus fraterque paterque  
et soror: una locum cervix dabit omnibus astris.

Why the wife of Vespasian was not consecrated is a puzzle (p. 48)—yet may not the answer be simple? She was not a member of the *Gens Flavia*. In the matter of the worship of that family, there is interesting evidence in the poem of the *Argonautica* of Valerius Flaccus. Professor Scott—and the present reviewer—will now have to take serious account of the view of Mr. R. J. Getty (*C.P.* XXXI, 1936, 53 ff.). The date of the introduction of the imperial cult into the provinces of the West is an important historical problem (pp. 34 ff.), especially as concerns Gallia Narbonensis (Dessau, *ILS* 6964). Scott here reproduces the theories recently advocated by Miss Abaecherli of Bryn Mawr. Trials for *maiestas* were an alarming feature of the late years of Domitian. Here Scott (pp. 126-132) is perhaps a little too brief in proportion to the importance of the theme. One would have welcomed a full discussion. In the cases recorded on partial evidence, was *maiestas* always the main charge of the indictment? Were the trivial

offences alleged in fact the reasons for condemnation? Enemies of evil Emperors sometimes affected to believe, for example, that their victims' offence had been *maiestas*, not *repetundae* (see Tacitus, *Hist.* I, 77). However that may be, Scott can hardly be right about Junius Rusticus, punished for describing Thræsa Paetus and Helvidius Priscus as 'sanctissimi viri'. He writes 'the application of the term *sanctissimus* to mere men (and especially to enemies of Caesarism) would be an injury to the majesty of the Emperor and his family, who alone of all men were sacred' (p. 128). This neglects the traditional and purely secular meaning of *sanctissimus* (frequent and classical).

The following points also call for emendation. Vespasian was not the 'commander of the Syrian army' (pp. 1 and 2). Primus and Alienus are interchanged (p. 14). It was not Vespasian (p. 21) but Mucianus who entered the theatre at Antioch and delivered a speech there, 'satis decorus etiam Graeca facundia, omniumque quae diceret atque ageret arte quadam ostentator' (*Hist.* II, 80). Domitian's wife was not in all ways above reproach. But Domitia was not the noctivagous and indefatigable Empress of Juvenal's Sixth Satire (p. 83). That was Messalina.

RONALD SYME.

Trinity College, Oxford.

#### ROMAN COINS FROM NERVA TO HADRIAN.

H. MATTINGLY: *Coins of the Roman Empire in the British Museum*. Vol. III: Nerva to Hadrian. Pp. cxcvi + 640; 102 plates. London: British Museum, 1936. Cloth, £3 3s.

In this third volume of his Catalogue Mr Mattingly has more than maintained the high standard which his earlier volumes have led us to expect. He gives complete descriptions of 3248 coins in the Museum and 577 from elsewhere; the plates illustrate 1550 specimens. This may be compared with the works of Strack (*Untersuch. zur röm. Reichsprägung*), which describe 1876 and illustrate 882, or Mattingly and Sydenham

(*Roman Imperial Coinage*, Vol. 2.), with 2056 and 165. The user of this book can feel confident that the material at his disposal is as complete as it can at present be made.

Advance in numismatics, as in most archaeological spheres, must depend largely on the establishment of an accurate chronology, and the research of recent years, much of it Mr Mattingly's own, has led to great progress in this respect. For Hadrian, the long third consulship (119-138) has been subdivided by Mr Mattingly, basing himself on the work of Laffranchi and Strack, as well as his own, into no

less than five successive groups, some of them with subdivisions. In a review in this journal of his previous work (see above) exception was taken to the classification as posthumous issues of the large series with obverse legend HADRIANVS AVGVSTVS PP. It is satisfactory to find it now on convincing grounds assigned to 128-132 A.D. Similarly the coinage of Trajan's fifth consulship (103-111 A.D.), largely through the work of Strack as modified and corrected by Mr Mattingly, now falls into three chronological groups.

But most readers of *C.R.* will find their chief interest in the historical interpretations of reverse types and legends set out in the elaborate Introduction. Here are two reigns of great importance for which the literary evidence is as meagre as it is unreliable. We look therefore all the more eagerly for light from the copious and diverse coinage. And this is now more richly provided through the greater depth and precision with which recent research has enabled the types to be interpreted. Take two examples from the reign of Trajan:

(a) Between about 104 and 114 A.D. most of the issues have the title in the dative and the dedicatory formula SPQR OPTIMO PRINCIPI. It is shown that this must mean that 'shortly after the first Dacian War the Senate paid a great and formal act of homage to Trajan, placing him second only to *Iupiter Opt. Max.* as the perfect Emperor, under whom the *optimus status verum*, of which Cicero and Augustus had dreamed, had become a fact'; and for the next ten years the coinage is the record, and by its diversity of types the justification, of this assertion, providing a monument whose visibility is not limited to a single

place, but is conterminous with those into whose hands the coins may pass. The bearing of this on the relations of Senate and Princeps, and more generally on the philosophical conception of the Empire as realized in space and time, needs no emphasis.

(b) In 107 Trajan melted down all the worn-out coinage (Dio 68. 15). Thereupon he issued a great series of restorations of Republican *denarii* down to the middle of Augustus' reign and of *aurei* from Caesar to Nerva. These were copies of the originals with reverse legend IMP. CAES. TRAIAN. AVG. GER. DAC. P.P. REST (*ituit*). Evidently the occasion was taken to demonstrate that Roman history from its beginning was one harmonious whole: types like those of Pompey and Brutus, M. Tullius and C. Marius (though these had in fact nothing to do with the orator or the general) illustrate Tacitus' assertion of the mingling of *libertas* and *principatus*. It is indeed a pageant of Roman history comparable to those in the sixth or the eighth book of the *Aeneid*, as Mr Mattingly remarks.

Not less stimulating and suggestive are the interpretations of single types, e.g. of *Providentia* (p. lxxvii). The historical student will gain from the Introduction a valuable widening and deepening both of the political and of the religious conceptions inherent in the personification of abstract qualities which occur in such abundance.

But space only permits us to congratulate Mr Mattingly on a masterly accomplishment of a stage in his journey through the Imperial coinage and to wish him good fortune and good speed in the stages which follow.

D. ATKINSON.

*University of Manchester.*

#### MORE OF THE NEW LIDDELL-AND-SCOTT.

*A Greek-English Lexicon* compiled by H. G. LIDDELL and R. SCOTT. A New Edition. . . . Part 9: σίσυλλος —τραγάω. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1936. Paper, 10s. 6d.

In this section one looks first to see how σκινδαφός has fared. It has lost nothing, indeed has gained, for the

article now ends with 'κινδαφοί· ὄρνεα, καὶ ὄργανα κιθαριστήρια, καὶ Ἰνδοί, Hsch.

An improvement which may enlighten some historians is that συντελεῖν, of relations between communities, is no longer made to imply tribute; and it is a pity that *tributaries*

is used  
Plu. A  
Amo  
gained  
(no) lo  
στολὴς

Now  
rection

στόμ  
very v  
Failing  
meanin  
quotati

στυγ  
see C.1

σφυρ

351a, r

ne supr

σῶμα

does no

σωφ

then is

for tha

dealt a

τῶν

Mr A.

me, fo

Pl. 66

records

τοιού

τοιούτα

add T

6. 33.

The

factive.

Monum

Series

to the

LAK

MSS

Berl

176-

MSS

Nos.

U.S.

and

1936

For th

notices

there

nearest

A.D. 11

is used in the version of a phrase from Plu. *Arat.* 54.

Among many other words that have gained are *σκάφη*, *σκηπτός*, *σκοτώδης* (no longer 'contr. for *σκοτοειδής*'), *στολός* and *στυλός*, *τεκνούς*, *τέλος*, *τοκεών*.

Now for a few criticisms and corrections.

*στόμα*: 'πρὸς τῷ σ. τοῦ βίου at the very verge of life, X. *Ages.* II. 15'. Failing other evidence for this unlikely meaning, read *τέρματι* in X. from the quotation in Plu.

*στιγνότης* in Plb. 3. 20. 3 is absurd: see C.R. XXXVIII 54.

*σφυρόν*: *ἀνώτερον τοῦ σ. λέγει*, Ath. 351a, might be quoted for the sake of *ne supra crepidam*.

*σῶμα* 2: in D. 22. 55 τὸ σῶμα σῶσαι does not mean 'save one's life'.

*σωφρόνη* is not mentioned. What then is the answer to Housman's case for that word (C.R. II 242, where he dealt also with *ἀφρόνη* and *εὐφρόνη*)?

*τᾶν* 'not in Ar.': an odd mistake, as Mr A. S. F. Gow has pointed out to me, for the eighth edition mentioned Pl. 66. Todd's *Index Aristophaneus* records a score of instances.

*τοιούτος*: from the evidence for *τοιούτο* subtract A. *Ag.* 315, where the *τοιούτο* of some texts is wanton; but add Th. 3. 89, and v.l. in I. 132 and 6. 33.

The notes of quantities are still defective. For instance, why not say

that *σκήπων* has *i*, and that the vowels of *σκυθρ-* and *σταθμ-* are short? The reader is not taught to distinguish between the *υ* of *στύφλος* and the *υ* which we can safely assume in *στρυφνός*. In general, 'weak position' is still a weakness in the book. Since no reference for correction in *σχέτλιος* is given from tragic trimeters, note I.A. 932. Of *τέκνον* we read that 'the penult. is occasionally long in Trag.': in fact it is long in over a hundred trimeters and tetrameters of the extant tragedies, short in thrice as many; and it is worth while to add that *τέκν-* is not used by A., and only in the vocative by S.

The five pages of additions and corrections are all new, not incorporating those of Part 8. Most welcome is it that the item *-ήρης* casts doubt on 'with ten, etc., banks of oars' and refers us to Tarn; and in the body of this Part the meaning now assigned to *τεσσαρακοντήρης* is sane. To my instance of *κλέους* (see C.R. XLIX 227), which is duly recorded, Mr F. H. Sandbach bids me add Cornutus 14.

Now that this great work is nearing completion, will the editors and publishers please reconsider what it should be called? Its present title is not apt for compendious citation. Why not give us what can properly be represented by 'L.-S.<sup>9</sup>' or 'LS<sup>9</sup>'?

E. HARRISON.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

## GREEK MINUSCULE MSS.

*Monumenta Palaeographica Vetera*. First Series. *Dated Greek Minuscule MSS. to the year 1200 A.D.*, edited by Kirsopp LAKE and Silva LAKE. Fasc. V: MSS. in Paris, Part II, Oxford, Berlin, Vienna and Jerusalem; Nos. 176-213, Pls. 301-373. Fasc. VI: MSS. in Moscow and Leningrad; Nos. 214-257, Pls. 374-452. Boston, U.S.A.: American Academy of Arts and Sciences (London: Christophers), 1936. Portfolios, 40s. each.

For the scope of this work see former notices (XLIX. 180, L. 80). Again there are no classical MSS.; the nearest approach is a *Lexicon*, No. 184, A.D. 1116, at Paris, and Alcinoi *Epitome*

*Philosophiae Platonicae*, No. 204, A.D. 924, at Vienna. The eighteen Paris books, from A.D. 1071 on, are not in Omont: the most interesting is No. 190, a Tetraevangelion written in Sicily in 1167, with some initials in Latin style, rude figures and a colophon with the regnal years of the Emperor Manuel, Amaury I King of Jerusalem, and William II of Sicily. The six books at Christ Church, Oxford, are not of special importance. Of the four at Berlin No. 200 is a curiosity, being a Greek Psalter written in Milan between 856 and 897 entirely in carolingian minuscule: the Latin creed has a Greek translation; the only Greek in

Greek letters (uncials) is the very incorrect colophon. Is this a monument of Irish erudition from Bobbio, or more probably directly derived from Southern Italy?

Of the nine MSS. at Vienna, some of them due to Busbecq, No. 208, Denys the Areopagite, raises an amusing point: it is dated Friday, 17 January, Indiction 1, in the reign of Manuel. Our authors have marked it 1153 (?), 1168 (?), i.e. under Manuel I, though they say that its appearance does not exclude the possibility of its belonging to the reign of Manuel II. I felt that it must be too late to come into this series, and was relieved to find that of the five possible years, 1153, 1168, 1393, 1408 and 1423, only 1393 had a Friday on January 17. No. 213 is a well-decorated copy of the Gospels at the Panagia Convent in Jerusalem (Fasc. I gives the Patriarchal Library there): the fine silver binding is duly figured.

Fasc. VI is devoted to MSS. in Russia. Here our authors come after the pioneer Sabas, and particularly Cereteli (Ts'ereteli) et Sobolevski, *Exempla Codd. Gr.*, Moscow, 1911: to them I have always been grateful for the gift of their splendid book. The old Patriarchal or Synodal Library at Moscow is now in the Historical Museum there: of the twenty MSS. reproduced three quarters at least were brought from Athos in 1775 by Arseni Sukhanov. C. et S. show them all. Nos. 214 and 215 date back to 880 and 899. No. 217, A.D. 932, belonged to Arethas, and is characteristically beautiful. C. et S. give three MSS. not

here shown, Univ. 1, Basil Hexaemeron, c. 911; Univ. 2, Apostolos, 1072, splendidly decorated; and Rummyantsev Mus. 6, Gospels, 1043.

The collection in the Public Library at Leningrad is of the first importance, but not very happy in its history. The thirteen complete books include No. 234, A.D. 835, the oldest of dated Greek minuscules, the Gospels brought from S. Saba by Porphyry Uspenski (I wish I had as good a photograph of his equally famous uncial Psalter of A.D. 862), with three other whole MSS., and three books from the Coisliniana *ex Musaeo Petri Dubrowsky*, that strange erratic block of Western MSS. cast up in Russia by the French Revolution. Two books given by C. et S. are not here, both Gospels, one of A.D. 1054, one of 1061. But what are we to say of Uspenski's stray pages? Do we count it a palliation that when he took a leaf out he would scribble date and provenance upon it and write in the MS. *hic deest unum folium*? Eleven are reproduced here, nineteen by C. et S., different selections. Our authors have given some under Jerusalem and hope to give others under Sinai. The title-pages from three now at Birmingham are another story, but can we wonder that the monks of S. Catherine are ill-disposed to wandering scholars? Yet we may hope that our authors will still be admitted to take photographs at Sinai and so to complete their wonderful work.

ELLIS H. MINNS.

Cambridge.

#### A CATALOGUE OF CATALOGUES.

*A list of printed catalogues of Greek manuscripts in Italy*, by J. ENOCH POWELL. Pp. 200-213. London: Bibliographical Society, 1936. Paper; copies free from the author at Trinity College, Cambridge.

POSSESSORS of this brochure should remember that, as Mr. Powell tells them, it deals only with classical Greek manuscripts in Italy. Mr. Powell, who, as he says, is occupied over the painful task of recollating Thucydides, is not

interested in palaeography, patristic literature, or bibliography. The value of his compilation is in so far reduced. The larger Italian libraries—Turin, Milan, Modena, Florence—as well as the town libraries in Rome, have been exhaustively catalogued in print (Venice has not, as Mr. Powell informs us, nor perhaps Naples), and in the lesser libraries there are not many MSS. of the Greek classics; I can only think of the Aristophanes once in the Classense at

Raven  
Galen  
and a  
Peter  
1890  
(Bolog  
been  
filology  
his di  
Marti  
with  
must  
North  
the g  
Theop  
owing  
traduc  
It  
has e  
though  
some

Revue  
128.  
1934  
THIS  
'Naus  
Calhou  
Plutar  
out re  
contrib  
Homer  
which  
Iliad,  
traditi  
Homer  
M. M  
the fe  
somev  
is ine  
work  
his fa  
first p  
by P  
Achai  
Bay o  
review  
now  
incon  
is no  
hand  
of the  
for us  
Troy  
but w  
Daghe  
to for  
sider  
prop  
assur  
of ev  
opfer

Ravenna, an Odyssey at Cesena, a Galen and two Hermogenes at Messina, and a Galen in the Archives of St. Peter's at Rome. Moreover since about 1890 most of the smaller collections (Bologna, Pesaro, Piacenza etc.) have been catalogued in the *Studi italiani di filologia classica* by Girolamo Vitelli and his disciples, and elsewhere by Emidio Martini. The traveller therefore, even with Mr. Powell's book in his hand, must not expect to find much. The North-Italian libraries are sadly reduced; the glory of Verona, the tenth-century Theognis, not only is now at Paris, but owing to an absurd error of Bekker's is traduced as *Mutinensis*.

It is hardly possible that anything has escaped Mr. Powell's diligence. I thought M. Henri Omont had done something at Udine, but perhaps he

limited himself to Aleandro's diary; I thought someone had been after me at Perugia, and I fancied that someone, whose name escaped me, had made a list of the few Greek MSS. at Monte Cassino;<sup>1</sup> to have disinterred the auction catalogue of the Borghese library in 1892 shows indeed great research.

The great unexhausted source for Greek manuscripts, sacred and profane, in Italy is the Apostolical Library, of the *Vaticani greci* of which we must pray that His Eminence Cardinal Mercati may be given years, *πολλὰ τὰ ἔτη*, to continue the list.

T. W. ALLEN.

*Queen's College, Oxford.*

<sup>1</sup> P.S.—It is Sadjak, *de codicibus graecis in monte Cassino* [sic], Krakau 1912.—I notice that on p. 209 the heading *Biblioteca Angelica* is out of place.

*Revue des Études Homériques.* Tome IV. Pp. 128. Monaco (4, Chemin de la Turbie), 1934. Paper, 25 fr.

THIS volume opens with a pleasant study, 'Nausicaa and Aristarchus', by Mr. George Calhoun, in which the lady is defended against Plutarch's charges of *ῥάσος* and *ἀκολασία* without recourse to athetesis. M. Charles Marot contributes a discussion of the nature of pre-Homeric Greek poetry and the circumstances which assisted 'Homer', the creator of our *Iliad*, to construct his epic on the basis of this traditional literature. Well versed in the Homeric literature of the twentieth century, M. Marot is ingenious and candid in his use of the few pieces available for this attractive if somewhat overplayed game, but the net result is inevitably meagre. The third article is the work of the editor, M. Vellay, and deals with his favourite theme of the site of Troy. The first part criticizes the view, lately resuscitated by Professor Patroni, that the site of the Achaean *naustathmos* is to be found at Besika Bay on the west coast of the Troad; the second reviews the results of the American excavations now in progress at Hissarlik, a somewhat incongruous task to be undertaken by one who is no archaeologist and has apparently no first-hand acquaintance with the site. An adherent of the view of Demetrios of Skepsis as retailed for us by Strabo, M. Vellay identifies Priam's Troy not with Hissarlik, the site of New Ilion, but with 'Ἰλιὸν κώμη, which he locates at Bally Dagh. We do not know what led Demetrios to formulate his theory (apart from general considerations, based on Plato, of the altitude proper to prehistoric sites), but we have his own assurance that it was not anything of the nature of evidence, for, as he tells us, *οὐδὲν ἔχονος σφίτερι τῆς ἀρχαίας πύξεως*. For M. Vellay this

is enough. At Hissarlik there are, regrettably, *ἔχνη*; Hissarlik is disqualified at the start.

H. L. LORIMER.

*Somerville College, Oxford.*

Beniamino STUMPO: *Nuove osservazioni sul Prometeo di Eschilo*. Pp. 30. Rome: Maglione, 1934. Paper, L. 4.

THIS pamphlet sets forth at greater length the explanation that twelve years before Signor Stumpo had given of the *Prometheus* as allegorical, representing the struggle of human intelligence in the search for God. Aeschylus, much influenced by Orphism and Pythagoreanism, has allegorized, like Prometheus *ἐμπλέων αἰβήματα*. The poet with his profoundly religious temperament cannot admire the obstinacy of the Titan, who presumes too much on his past services (he is 'the man who won the war'). Prometheus makes mistakes; he is wrong in thinking that Zeus' rule is in danger or that Herakles can possibly act against him. The contradictions and errors are those of the human mind baffled by the difficulties of understanding the true nature of God.

This main thesis is followed by two shorter sections, neither of which is very convincing. In the first Signor Stumpo returns to the conventional order, making the *Πυρρόπος* the first play of the trilogy, and quoting the *Choephoroe* as a parallel to the seemingly unnecessary repetition of the theme of the preceding play; but there is a great difference between the allusiveness of that play and the direct narrative of this. He does not explain how *Πυρρόπος* can mean 'fire-stealer'; he tries to avoid the difficulty of the Scholion: *ἐν τῷ Πυρρόπῳ τρεῖς μυριάδας φησὶ δέδωσθαι αὐτὸν* by reading *δέδωκεσθαι*. In the second section he finds reasons for dating the



play about 470, among them being 'gli elementari metrici', but the overlap of the senarii would itself be evidence for a later date. To treat the *Prometheus* as earlier than the *Septem* seems about as probable as dating the *Tempest* before the *Comedy of Errors*.

The work is written in an interesting manner and with a wholesome avoidance of rhetoric.

A. S. OWEN.

Keble College, Oxford.

#### *Neue Fragmente des Aischylos und Sophokles.*

Von C.-E. FRITSCH. Pp. 63. Hamburg: Hans Christian, 1936. Paper.

THE chief interest of this doctoral dissertation lies in its treatment of no. 11, 'Kommentar zu einer Tragödie des Sophokles (?)'. The letters *βυθον* and *νιδοςγαμοισανανλο* and *βηναι* *ταλασσεικαικυβερ* and *ισμησηντροπινεικαιαγομ* point to iambics and to the tragic style, and Fritsch votes for Sophocles. Now *eikaia* does not leap to the eye, and *αναυλο*, after *γαμοισ*, certainly suggests *αναυλους* rather than the only other word beginning so that the dictionaries offer: but *ταλασσει* points straight to one place only in all Greek. *ταλασσει* pap., corr. *Μεαυτις* (to *τάλας* εἰ), spurning the gift of the gods. Hence all this sweat. See Lycophron *Alex.* 744 ff. A postscript, type-written and 'laid in', tells us that Fritsch knows better now. But why follow the blind with one's eyes shut?

On his other pieces the author comments diligently and without disaster, and those who want any help that they can get with the papyraceous scraps of tragedy had better buy this worthy little book.

E. HARRISON.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

#### Karl KLAUS: *Die Adjektiva bei Menander.*

(Klassisch-Philologische Studien herausgegeben von Ernst Bickel und Christian Jensen, Heft 8.) Pp. xvi+160. Leipzig: Harrassowitz, 1936. Paper, M. 8.

THIS work is an alphabetical list of the adjectives found in Menander's plays and fragments. Under each adjective is given a list of the other authors in whom it is found, without references, then the Menander references with indications of the meaning. When the word is a very common one, e.g. *ἀγαθός*, the list of authors is omitted and the references to Menander, with their interpretation, provide material for a long article. Footnotes give references to dissertations, articles, grammars, lexica, etc., in which the words have been discussed. The list of the works thus referred to fills pp. ix-xiv, and will no doubt be useful to many others besides those whose immediate interest is the vocabulary of Menander. The whole dissertation is a model of methodical compilation and arrangement, and if no very new conclusions emerge, that is no doubt because it is intended that the reader should draw these for himself. The limitation to adjectives is not dictated by any belief that anything can be said about the adjectives as such, but by limitations of space,

so that the work is in effect a fragment of a lexicon to Menander.

R. MCKENZIE.

Oxford.

#### Roger A. PACK: *Studies in Libanius and Antiochene Society under Theodosius.* Pp. xii+126. Menasha, Wisconsin: George Banta Publishing Company, 1935. Paper.

THIS doctoral thesis submitted to the University of Michigan consists for the most part of a translation and commentary on Libanius *Or.* XLV, *de Vincitis*, together with two introductory essays on 'The Spirit of Social Criticism and the Ideal Order' and 'Social Forces Inimical to the Ideal Order'.

The translation is very faulty. Not only does it frequently render more obscure the meaning of the Greek, but it contains some very serious mistranslations. To quote only three of the most serious: c. 17, *εἰ μὲν ἔωρον περὶ ταῦτα τὸν ἀπαντα ἀναλίσκόμενον χρόνον*, 'If I saw all the time that is wasted on these details'; c. 31, *ἤμειψεν τὸν τόπον τοῦ δεδίσθαι μένοντος*, 'changed the location of the man who was awaiting commitment'; c. 32, *ἔθηκεν νόμον βοηθοῦντα τοῖς δεθείσι περὶ τὸν χρόνον*, 'you have promulgated a law in relief of those imprisoned for indefinite periods'.

The commentary, which seems on the whole sound, contains a large number of references to Libanius himself, to other authors, and to the laws (many of the latter derived, as Mr. Pack himself points out, from Godefroy's edition of the speech). Yet here too the work is not free from faults. In his note on c. 1, *χάρων τὴν μεγίστην*, Mr. Pack finds two mutually exclusive theories put forward by earlier authorities. Being apparently unwilling to reject either, he states one as true and the other, with a slight alteration, as possible. On pp. 100 f. we have a long note based on a mistranslation of c. 4 *ἴν. τὸν ταῖς ἀρχαῖς ὑπεροῦντων*.

The two introductory essays provide a useful collection of material concerning the views of Libanius on the various social questions with which he dealt. There is, however, a noticeable tendency to forget that Libanius was a rhetor and to treat some of his statements more seriously than they deserve.

M. J. BOYD.

Queen's University, Belfast.

Hans Joachim METTE: *Sphairopotia.* Untersuchungen zur Kosmologie des Krates von Pergamon. Mit einem Anhang: Texte. Pp. xx+316. Munich: Beck, 1936. Cloth, (export price) RM. 11.25.

HERR METTE set himself the task of recovering the views of Crates of Mallos on the shape of the cosmos and of the earth. The task was not an easy one. The cosmological opinions of Crates are known essentially only from his interpretation of Homer. The fragments of this exegesis are not abundant, and the principal collection of them (that of Kurt Wachsmuth in his *De Cratete Mallota*, 1860) is incomplete, out-of-date, and inconvenient in arrangement. Later additions to the material and later interpretations still left much to be done. It is unlikely

however, that much remains to be added to Herr Mette's collection of fragments and illustrative material, and his interpretation carries conviction.

In his Introduction (pp. v-xx) Herr Mette argues that Crates identifies the Homeric world-scheme with his own; accordingly to recover his interpretation of cosmological and geographical passages in Homer is to recover his own cosmological and geographical opinions. These opinions form the culmination of a long development. First clearly discernible in the *Phaedo* of Plato, and then in the *Republic* and the *Timaeus*, their development can be traced through Eudoxos, Aristotle, Eudemos, Pytheas and Eratosthenes. They are the views also of Zeno and the early Stoa, though the Homeric exegesis of Cleanthes and Chrysippos was not essentially cosmic like that of Crates. The most complete and the clearest exposition of this conception of the plan of heaven and earth is to be found in the *Eisagōgē eis ta phainόμενα* of 'Geminus'. But this plan is already demonstrably that of Crates.

The detailed demonstration of this thesis from the fragments of the Homeric exegesis follows in pp. 1-96. The remainder, far the largest portion, of the volume is devoted to a collection of texts, not limited to the fragments of Crates but embracing all the sources on which Herr Mette has based his argument. This collection of texts, assembled often from sources difficult of access, intelligently presented, and edited with meticulous care, should prove very valuable to students of Greek science. One or two diagrams would facilitate the comprehension of the subject.

B. FARRINGTON.

University College, Swansea.

Berthold HÄSLER: *Favorin, über die Verban-nung*. Pp. 65. Böttrup i.W.: printed by Postberg, 1935. Paper.

NOW that the discovery of a large part of Favorinus' *περί φυγῆς* has strengthened the reasons for ascribing to him two speeches attributed to Dio Chrysostom, a collected edition of his works and fragments would be desirable. Such an edition the author of this dissertation hopes some day to produce; meanwhile he gives us this earnest, which shows that so far as good orientation and wide interests go he is fitted for the task.

He here discusses the construction of the piece, given unity by the image of the soul's contest with a number of adversaries, and some other features of style; the *τόποι* employed by Favorinus and some other writers on the same subject are analysed and compared in a manner more restricted but more penetrating than that of Dr Antonini in *Rend. Acad. Linc.* 1934, an article which seemingly appeared too late to be referred to; and a good attempt is then made to compare the spirit of these various writers.

He is less happy in his lengthy handling of the textual problem of 25, 32, apparently failing to understand that the preceding 'disembarkation in the port of happiness' is death. The demands of sense and the (possibly misleading) appearances of the facsimile seem to be met

rather by the following: ἐκεῖ μένων οὐκ ἐνφοβήσῃ (-ο - ~). [καὶ τῷ?] ἀκῆφος ἀπὸ τοῦ μεγίστου κυβερνήτου [ἀρ]φ[αλ]ῆ[ς α]λλεῖ σαζόμενον τε καὶ προβομένον ἀλλους ἐξ ἄλλων ἐπιβάτας ἀναλμψεται (-ο ο - ~). δς [δὲ ἦν] καὶ μέγιστος κλῆρος λείπεται κτλ. Cf. L. & S.<sup>9</sup> s.v. ἀπό III. 4. Dr Häslér's explanation of κλῆρος as slang of the arena, 'antagonist assigned by the draw', is plausible, but in the same sentence he follows the original editors in corrupting ἀνερὸν to ἀνεκτον. Favorinus is elaborating the familiar phrase ἀφετος or ἀνερὸς (Philostr. *Imagines* p. 335 Kayser, v.l. in [Plut.] *Mor.* 12A) νύμσθαι. Since he uses ἀφετος in line 41 he had reason to choose the other form here.

A useful bibliography of Favorinus is added, in which I miss only Baehrens' article in *Hermes* 1915, p. 456.

F. H. SANDBACH.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

J. W. FUCHS: *Index Verborum in Ciceronis de Inventione* Libros II. Pars prior (a-lego). Pp. xviii+82. The Hague: van Scherpen-zeel, 1936. Paper.

THE youthful treatise which goes by the name of *De Inventione*, arid as most of its matter is, is of some importance for the study of the development of its author's language, and this index is a useful complement to those which exist for the philosophical and oratorical works and for the *Partitiones Oratoriae*, written on a similar subject some forty years later. The work has been carefully carried out, on the basis of Stroebel's text, and the admirably clear printing makes it easy to use; for most words the lists of references are followed by lists of *iuncturae* and *locutiones*. I have noted only two omissions—a fourth example of anastrophe of *de* (2. 141) and the single example of anastrophe of *in* (1. 28)—and very few slips; *arescit* (in an epigram quoted from Apollonius) is wrongly marked as occurring 'in lege aliqua vel formula', *planum facere* is misplaced, and *illud extremum* (1. 85, 2. 34) appears both under 'ille subst.' and under 'extremum subst.'

A short English introduction brings together some interesting statistics on points of language—variation of forms (*imito* and *-or*, *confici* and *-feri*, gerunds in *-undum*, etc.), use of synonyms and compound verbs, suffixes of abstract nouns, illative particles (*De Inv.* agrees with the earlier speeches in a marked preference for *itaque*). The occasional oddities of the English ('gender' for 'voice' of a verb, 'circumscribed' for 'periphrastic') will not trouble the reader, but there are one or two mistakes to be corrected; *legasit* ought not to appear in a list of contracted forms (p. xi), and *adversari* cannot be gen. sing. in 1. 85 (p. viii).

C. J. FORDYCE.

University of Glasgow.

Robert J. GETTY: *The Lost St. Gall MS. of Valerius Flaccus*. Pp. 33. (Aberdeen University Studies, No. 110.) Aberdeen: University Press, 1934. Paper.

THIS is an admirably lucid and scholarly study of the MS tradition of Valerius, directed mainly to one long-debated problem, but incidentally

summarizing and clarifying the whole question of our textual sources and their value.

The main sources (apart from Florilegia) are the extant V, the lost MS of Carrio, and the group of MSS derived from S, discovered by Poggio in 1416, and lost to sight again not long after. The two main problems are the reconstitution of the text of S and the relation of S to V. Mr. Getty has had in his hands collations of all the six MSS involved, including his own collations of the Malatestianus (from Cesena), which had not previously been collated, and of the Oxoniensis, and uses this material to produce a clear, consistent, and on the whole satisfactory account of their interrelation. The S group had long been recognized as falling into two main sections, one of which derives from Poggio's own copy, the other probably from a copy made for Bartolommeo of Montepulciano. The fresh points now made are chiefly two: first, that II, Vaticanus 1614, always the hardest of the six to place, is not connected directly either with the Poggio group (a) or with the Bartolommeo group (β), but represents an independent copy of S, which Mr. Getty supposes to have been corrected from the V tradition; II itself being revised from a member of the a group. This seems as fair a solution as one can expect of a difficult problem in the 'cross-breeding' of MSS. The second main result is a satisfactory arrangement of the stemma of the group, two MSS of which the author has himself collated.

Thus equipped, he proceeds to the larger question of the status of S, and its value as an independent source; his decision is strongly in its favour, and against the view that S was an apograph of V. On one or two smaller points his conclusions are admittedly provisional, but there is throughout a convincing combination of much detailed argument, with a clear presentation of the picture as a whole. Mr. Getty is to be congratulated on a careful and interesting piece of work.

W. J. M. MACKENZIE.

Magdalen College, Oxford.

Hans Gottlob SEILER: *Die Masse bei Tacitus*. Erlangen: Palm und Enke, 1936. Paper, M. 3.

THIS monograph is a welcome contribution to the study of mass-psychology, and it fills a gap. Nothing but the comparative neglect of the subject until recent times can account for the fact that hitherto mass-psychology in such a consummate master of it as Tacitus has received but niggardly treatment. Moreover, Herr Seiler is fortunate in having to deal with an aspect of Tacitus that is clear of all controversy. It is merely necessary to accumulate and marshal the relevant passages: their effect on the reader's mind is well-nigh overwhelming.

The author's analysis and comments are masterly. The 'masses', he explains, are the people and the army. The 'people' includes three 'masses'—the *plebs*, the *populus*, and the senate. He allows that to call the senate in Tacitus a mass may seem surprising. It is surprising, and what he writes about the senate hardly justifies his claim, for in proof of his

position he can only point to the behaviour of the senate as exhibited in the opening chapters of the *Annals*. In the bibliography nothing written in English, beyond a solitary article, is included. Had Herr Seiler read Professor Marsh's *Reign of Tiberius*—to mention only one book—he might have seen reason to modify what he has written, and to doubt, at least, whether the senate, as it appears in Tacitus, can be so conveniently labelled.

In the chapter on 'the Emperor and the mass', the 'Emperor' turns out to be Tiberius only.<sup>1</sup> Most of that entitled 'Tacitus as artist' is borrowed from a previous writer; and 'Tacitus als Politiker' does not seem an exact title to the chapter so called.

The whole monograph makes exceedingly interesting reading. The author has the German literature of mass-psychology at his fingers' ends; he alludes to dicta of Machiavelli, General von Blomberg, and the Führer, and draws parallels from the French Revolution and an incident in the New Testament.

E. C. MARCHANT.

Lincoln College, Oxford.

Norman H. BAYNES: *The Political Ideas of St. Augustine's De Civitate Dei*. Pp. 18. (Historical Association Pamphlet No. 104.) London: Bell, 1936. Paper. 1s. 1d. (to non-members).

OF the *De Civitate Dei* it might well be written as it was once of the Bible,

Hic liber est in quo quaerit sua dogmata quisque,

Invenit et pariter dogmata quisque sua,

and to attempt within the compass of a single lecture a summary of the political ideas which Augustine over more than a dozen years poured into its pages, and which for the last millennium and a half have been indiscriminately used by contending parties in dogmatic controversy 'as brickbats with which to lay low political opponents' (p. 3), might seem an impossible undertaking. But the task has not daunted Professor Baynes, and he has succeeded, to an extent which must command unstinted admiration, in presenting the main elements of Augustine's political thought in a form which the more reasonable of those contending parties at any rate must regard as essentially fair. Professor Baynes emphasizes the Biblical origin of the conception of the two cities, and this is no doubt the main source of the idea: yet there are traces too in the *De Civitate* of the influence of those other heavenly cities which from Plato onwards had been familiar enough in Greek and Roman political thought: and if, beside his final insistence that to Augustine 'will is the paramount factor in human life' (p. 16), we set the *Da quod iubet et iube quod vis* which provoked the passionate protest of Pelagius, and remember that it is not human will but divine grace which in the last resort differentiates those *duas societates hominum, quarum est una quae*

<sup>1</sup> Something is wrong with some of the references in this chapter (p. 78).

*praedestinata est in aeternum regnare cum Deo, altera aeternum supplicium subire cum diabolo*, we do so only to illustrate Professor Baynes's point that Augustine's thought has never been exhausted by any of those systems which men have sought to build upon it.

To the select bibliography H. X. Arquillière's *L'Augustinisme politique* (Paris, 1934) and Yves de la Brière's chapter in the *Mélanges Augustiniens* (Paris, 1931) might perhaps be added with advantage.

J. N. L. MYRES.

Christ Church, Oxford.

Arvast NORDH: *Prolegomena till den romerska Regionskatalogen*. Pp. viii+144. Gothenburg: Eranos' Förlag, 1936. Paper, kr. 4.

IN this doctoral dissertation Nordh first investigates the manuscript traditions of the *Curiosum* and *Notitia* texts of the *Regionary Catalogue*. The *Curiosum* is the older tradition and A (Vat. lat. 3321) the source of all its other MSS. The *Notitia* MSS, however, are independent of one another. B (Laur. 89, 67) and two minor MSS come from a fusion of the *Curiosum* and *Notitia* traditions. Then, because in his opinion the theory that the aim of the *Regionary Catalogue* is to describe the boundaries of the several Augustan regions of Rome has been shelved for insufficient reasons, he re-examines this theory but rejects it because the items under the regions do not in fact describe their boundaries. He also rejects Lanciani's variation, namely that these items represent not monuments themselves but *uici* named after them which formed the boundaries of the regions. Nordh's own opinion is that they stand for localities, not *uici*, named after monuments, and that these localities were the *sub-regiones* of a reorganization of Rome which he supposes to have taken place about A.D. 300. Although the number of *uici* in the regions varies, the number of *uicomagistri* is always the same, namely 48. Furthermore, addresses of persons in the city of Rome as given in inscriptions, in the authors, and even in documents from the Papal Chancery as late as the eleventh century, often contain items which occur in the *Regionary Catalogue*. Later generations, not understanding its purpose, interpolated details which have point in a guide-book but not in a list of administrative regions.

Though in his main conclusion Nordh seems as 'arbitrary' as those he condemns, notably Mommsen and Jordan, the value of his work in illustrating the *Regionary Catalogue* and allied subjects is scarcely lessened. He defends the form 'luparii' as against 'lupanarii' (Reg. II) and argues that despite Martial 8, 44, 6 *equus magnus*, not plain *equus*, was the colloquial Latin for an equestrian statue. In this connection *equos Tiridatis*, not *equum*, is the correct reading in Reg. VII and the reference is to stables maintained by Tiridates. He brings linguistic evidence against Armini's notion that *lapis pertusus* (Reg. VII) can refer to the *Muro torto* of the Pincian but supports Lundström's identification of the *Ludus matutinus* (see C.R. XLIV. 144). Nordh has one or two minor

inaccuracies, e.g. he takes the abbreviation for *uel* as *alii* and omits Preller from his list of abbreviations.

LESLIE F. SMITH.

Gunnar MICKWITZ: *Die Kartellfunktionen der Zünfte und ihre Bedeutung bei der Entstehung des Zunftwesens*. Eine Studie in spätantiker und mittelalterlicher Wirtschaftsgeschichte. Pp. 250. (Societas Scientiarum Fennica: Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum. VIII 3.) Helsingfors: Akademische Buchhandlung (Leipzig: Harrassowitz), 1936. Paper, Fmk. 85.

THIS book, written by a distinguished Swedo-Finnish scholar, aims at discovering connections between the Principate and the Byzantine Empire on the one hand, and on the other the economic system of the guilds in medieval Europe. Thus the authors throws new light *implicite* on the beginning of modern capitalism. The German style is remarkably good and clear, especially for a non-German (assisted by a German corrector).

Chapters I-IV deal with the economic principles of the guilds in Italy, France, Germany and England. Chapters V-VIII portray the corporations of artisans of the time of the Principate, of the different Byzantine periods, and of Italy in the transitional stage between Roman and Carolingian rule. A comprehensive conclusion is given on page 232 ff. We have to consider this summary together with two articles published at the same time:

G. Mickwitz, 'Un problème d'influence: Byzance et l'économie de l'occident médiéval': *Annales d'histoire économique et sociale* 8 (1936) 21 f.;

G. Mickwitz, 'Die Organisationsformen zweier byzantinischer Gewerbe im X. Jahrhundert': *Byzant. Zeitschr.* 36 (1936) 63 f.

They elaborate the author's views which are here summarized. A bibliography, a survey of medieval sources, and an index conclude the book, but unfortunately an Index Locorum of ancient writers and documents, which is urgently needed, is missing.

Mickwitz shows us in detail that the guilds of antiquity before Diocletian did not think it their duty to look after their members' private economic interests. Nevertheless there was a discernible development in the centuries of the late Roman Empire in spite of the government's resistance to the corporations' efforts towards collective economic self-management of their trades.

The author does not fully establish a connection between the guilds of Byzantium and medieval Europe. But according to his analysis Byzantine influence in early medieval Pavia and Pisa seems to be very likely, a remarkable sort of after-life of the ancient world.

Cambridge.

F. M. HEICHELHEIM.

*The Klephtic Ballads in Relation to Greek History* (1715-1821). By John W. BAGGALLY, M.A., B.Litt. Pp. xiv+109. Oxford: Blackwell, 1936. Cloth, 7s. 6d.

By examining twenty-nine ballads in their relation to the events which they celebrate, Mr.



Baggally has tried to ascertain the historical value of these popular poems. He has used his material with care, and his general result is that it is 'impossible to rely upon them as first-hand evidence.' It has recently been necessary to face the problem of the actual forgery of ballads for local and personal purposes: this is always a possibility, and the matter has been brought to a head in Greece by the publication in 1935 at Athens of *Κλέφτες του Μοριά* by Γιάννης Βλαχογιάννης. This book attacks the genuineness, which means the sincerity, the contemporaneity, and the popular character, of the ballads relating to a klepht of the Morea named Zakharias Varvitsiotis, who had been made a great hero by Kandeloros in a book published in Athens in 1914, *ὁ Ἀρματολυσμός τῆς Πελοποννήσου*. Mr. Baggally has a most judicious appendix on this dispute; he has passed over, however, a long paper on Zakharias that was published in 1932 by Zannetos in the first volume of the periodical *Δακωνικά*, perhaps because it is not noticed by Vlachoyannis. Mr. Baggally's conclusions are well worth considering by anyone interested in popular poetry and ballads. He does not print Greek texts, but prose translations of the ballads; these are perhaps not very exciting, but translations in the metre of the original, though very easy to write, tend in English to be insufferably padded and monotonous in cadence. The book is to be recommended and should send readers to the original texts in Passow's *Carmina Popularia*; the other collections used are not so accessible in this country.

R. M. DAWKINS.

Exeter College, Oxford.

Sigurd AGRELL: *Die Pergamenische Zauberscheibe und das Tarockspiel*. Pp. 130; 68 figures. (Bulletin de la Société Royale des Lettres de Lund, 1935-1936, IV.) Lund: Gleerup, 1936. Paper, 3s.

THIS interesting and learned monograph carries further the work of Wunsch on the interpretation of the divinatory apparatus (saec. III p. C.) found at Pergamum. As regards the eight central compartments of the dish Agrell agrees that seven represent the planets, but suggests that the eighth is Ananke rather than the World Ruler. The interpretation of the symbols in the three concentric circles round the edge, which are placed in 3x8 compartments, is amended and extended by his wider knowledge of Egyptian hieroglyphics, upon which the symbols are mainly based. The series reads *houstrophedon*, the outer eight left to right, the middle eight right to left, the inner eight left to right, and Agrell further substantiates Wunsch's conjecture that they correspond to the twenty-four letters of the Greek alphabet. Details in so difficult a field cannot always be certain, but the general system appears to be established. Our author then turns to the twenty-two cards of *Tarocco*, which he interprets as based upon a similar system formed on the twenty-two letters of the Latin alphabet. Here some of the identifications appear a little far-fetched, but on the whole the general theory may well be right. Agrell has already pro-

pounded a similar theory, which I gather from some polemical passages has not been generally accepted by those who know of such things, about the runic alphabet. He has thus three similar systems of alphabetic magic having presumably a common source in the syncretism of late classical antiquity. The common source he thinks is Mithraic; here the evidence to me seems no more, though it is fair to say that it is no less, conclusive than that by which Dieterich once essayed to show that a well-known magical papyrus contained a Mithraic liturgy.

W. R. HALLIDAY.

King's College, London.

LORD RAGLAN: *The Hero. A Study in Tradition, Myth and Drama*. Pp. xi+311. London: Methuen, 1936. Cloth, 10s. 6d.

LORD RAGLAN opens with some destructive criticism, with much of which I agree, of the value of tradition as historical evidence. On the constructive side I find it more difficult to follow him, for he proceeds to claim that all stories about heroes and even nursery tales are really stories about ritual. The tourist at the meet has been heard to express wonder that 'the man in the red coat can know the dogs apart from each other'; and in truth if you know little enough about any series of related things they appear similar to each other in a degree proportionate to your ignorance. Hence the continual fascination of the search for the single golden key which is to unlock every problem, and the popularity of such articles of faith as British Israel or the Great Pyramid. Lord Raglan, whose particular solution of all tradition is reduction to 'the ritual pattern,' heralds the dawn of the scientific study of Homer; he is the herald only, for modesty compels him to admit that he is neither a Greek nor a German scholar. The first disability I had guessed upon internal evidence. He knows, however, that the scientific as contrasted with the literary study of the Homeric poems 'will show that these or rather the songs and stories out of which they were composed are myths, that is ritual narratives' connected with 'the group meetings at Delphi, Olympia, Delos,' etc., at which the ritual was concerned with 'the death and resurrection of the king, a sacred combat, a triumphal procession and enthronement, and a sacred marriage.' *Credat Iudaeus Apella*.

W. R. HALLIDAY.

King's College, London.

*Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome*. Vol. xiii. Pp. 220; 53 plates. Rome: American Academy, 1926. Paper.

THIS volume contains three articles. The first is an elaborate investigation by Bernard M. Peebles of the seven manuscripts of Sulpicius Severus used by Girolamo da Prato for his eighteenth-century edition, hitherto not superseded. He adds three identifications to the two already established. The other articles are both archaeological. Far the more important is a careful study by Marion E. Blake of second-century mosaics in Italy, illustrated by forty excellent plates. Her generalizations



are valuable, as well as her collection of material. The other is an architectural restoration by Olindo Grossi of the Forum of Julius Caesar and the Temple of Venus Genetrix in Rome.

D. S. ROBERTSON.

*Trinity College, Cambridge.*

G. CASTELLANO: *Benedetto Croce. Il filosofo —il critico—lo storico.* Pp. 208.

B. CROCE: *La Poesia. Introduzione alla critica e storia della poesia e della letteratura.* Pp. 352. Bari: Laterza, 1936. L. 12 and 25.

CASTELLANO here reprints a short, appreciative essay (dated 1923) on Croce's work in philosophy, history and literature; and adds a detailed list (occupying eighty pages) of Croce's publications from October 1882 to January 1936.

Croce's main object in the present book is to apply to poetry the well-known principles and paradoxes of his aesthetic. Thus he rejects 'pure poetry' (p. 57) because it implies a dualism which his philosophic theory condemns; not because it has been found impossible—a fact which rather confirms, against Croce, the Aristotelian 'dualism' of matter and form. At the same time, Croce illustrates his somewhat doctrinaire theories by drawing frequently upon his wide knowledge of poetry, including classical poetry. He also knows the ancient treatises on poetry and rhetoric. These, however, figure chiefly in the *false* history of poetry; for Croce is too thoroughly Romantic to sympathise with the ancient habit of not attempting to define the indefinable and of concentrating to an admittedly excessive degree upon the more or less measurable and mechanical features of literature and its kinds. Not that Croce thinks it possible to distinguish the 'spirit' of the different 'genres' psychologically in the Romantic manner. He is content with separating 'poetry' from 'literature.' Genuine poetry (he holds) is rare; and its roll does not include (among others) Aristophanes, Horace, or Walter Scott, any more than Demosthenes or Tacitus (all mentioned in the same list, p. 59). The reason given has the familiar Romantic ring: all these writers lack 'the divine melancholy.' Lucretius, however (though didactic literature, as such, is not poetic, p. 48), is a poet in spite of himself because 'he has suffered' (p. 237). One might rather suggest that Lucretius' greatness is due

to the fact that he has impressed his own vital personality upon his work. But the personality (in any intelligible sense) of the poet cannot receive its due from Croce, though he devotes one section to the subject; the poet, like the rest of us, is for him little more than an animated piece of history; he is indeed 'nothing but his poetry' (p. 147). In conclusion, it seems fitting that one should, particularly in this *Review*, call for sympathetic attention to Croce's complaint that most philologists are ludicrously lacking in appreciation for poetry; they resemble the 'asinus portans mysteria' (p. 70). This is an accusation which can never be brought against Croce, however much one may disagree with his philosophic standpoint.

For 'Platone' on its first occurrence in the index read 'Platen.'

J. TATE.

*University of St. Andrews.*

COLIN STILL: *The Timeless Theme: a critical theory formulated and applied.* Pp. ix+244. London: Ivor Nicholson and Watson, 1936. Cloth, 21s.

MR. STILL is of the opinion that 'all works of art which are the product of imaginative genius are mystical enigmas akin in character and significance to the religious mysteries; and they can be understood and interpreted only by the critic who is himself a mystic and who is capable of the spiritual perception of genius' (p. 18). When he comes to give some details of this, it appears that all the imaginative authors in question, of whatever race or age, use a symbolism based on the classical doctrine of the four elements, earth standing for the body, water for the 'sensual or passionate or impressional elements in man,' air for the 'rational or intellectual or spiritual element' and fire for the Pauline *σῶμα ἐνορπάσιον* (p. 21). As most authors mention some or all of these substances, Mr. Still proves his case to his own complete satisfaction. His competence to deal with Greek mysteries, to which he often refers, may be judged by the fact that he thinks Thomas Taylor an authority. It is a pity that this book was not in being in 1829, for it would have furnished material for one or two thoroughly amusing paragraphs in *Aglaphamus*.

H. J. ROSE.

*University of St. Andrews.*

## CORRESPONDENCE

A Monsieur le Directeur de 'The Classical Review.'

MONSIEUR LE DIRECTEUR,

Votre estimable *Revue* a publié sous la signature de M. A. W. Lawrence, en Novembre dernier, pp. 187-188, un compte-rendu de mon livre: *Manuel d'Archéologie Grecque, La Sculpture, période archaïque*. Bien que modestement respectueux des droits de la critique,

et bien que très obligé, en outre, à l'auteur de cette recension pour les appréciations favorables qu'il a bien voulu çà et là associer à ses critiques, il m'a semblé, ainsi qu'à mon éditeur, pouvoir faire appel à votre courtoisie bien connue pour une courte réponse, au sujet de certaines remarques que je puis croire, je l'avoue, un peu injustifiées.

Sur la forme du livre, d'abord. Elle était imposée d'office par la collection, où ont paru

bien d'autres manuels du même type, que M. Lawrence lui-même signale. Certains sont d'une typographie plus serrée (p. ex. Diehl, *Art Byzantin*); aucun n'est d'un autre aspect. C'est d'autre part, la première fois (*plus de 30 volumes publiés*) que la forme est critiquée: est-il juste d'écrire, des lors: 'The publisher (il est resté toujours le même) has fallen far below the standard of his predecessors in all technical matters'; de dire que l'impression et la mise en pages, '*soporifiques*', sont '*si abominables*' qu'elles empêchent une lecture suivie? On pourrait en appeler à d'autres lecteurs moins sévères, M. Lawrence étant seul, jusqu'ici en tous pays, à avoir exprimé un tel avis.

Des ouvrages du format et du genre de celui qui est en cause ne sont pas, certes, des *albums* de documents photographiques et ils ne visent qu'à donner une illustration *documentaire*, forcément réduite en dimensions. — On est un peu surpris que M. Lawrence souhaite pour les volumes suivants une diminution du nombre des figures, et qu'il ait tant critiqué, cette fois-ci, *en général*, la qualité de celles qu'on lui présentait.

Quant au texte du livre, je regrette d'avoir oublié dans la Muséographie le *Pelissaeus Museum* d'Hildesheim, mais il ne contient pas de sculpture grecque archaïque très importante. Si le livre de M. Rhys Carpenter: *The Greeks in Spain*, n'a pas été cité, c'est qu'il intéresserait surtout une étude de l'art ibérique, hors de mon sujet. Je n'ai pas prétendu énumérer toutes les collections de moulages, mais seulement les principales. P. 98, n. 3, je n'ai pas dit que les gobelets de Vaphio 'reproduisaient' un relief de stuc de Cnossos, mais que leurs décors avaient été *préparés* par l'art de Crète, ce qui n'est la même chose. J'ai été toujours un des plus empressés à marquer les

emprunts en retour faits par la statuaire de l'Égypte à la Grèce primitive (pp. 236 sqq.). Je n'ai pas voulu dire que les ivoires de Samarie (p. 303, n. 2) eussent fait partie de la Maison 'd'ivoire' d'Achab; j'ai marqué une simple analogie de la technique du décor. Une différence de dix à vingt ans sépare seulement la chronologie (p. 645) pour les métopes du temple C de Sélinonte (560-550 environ) de celle de M. B. Ashmole (après 550). Or mes dates sont défendables, et je ne suis pas seul à vouloir situer le groupe de ces documents le plus anciennement. — M. Lawrence m'a reproché de prendre la plupart de mes arguments, pour l'étude de la technique sculpturale, dans le bel ouvrage récent de M. St. Casson, que j'ai en effet utilisé et cité avec grand plaisir; mais il m'eût paru juste de signaler aussi, comme il a été fait ailleurs, mes conclusions parfois réservées et parfois si contraires (p. 201, n. 3), qui pourraient prouver que j'ai moi-même — à Delphes, à Thasos, à Délos, — travaillé sur le sujet, au contraire de ce qu'indique un peu dogmatiquement M. Lawrence.

Permettra-t-on enfin à un Français de rappeler amicalement à l'un de ses lecteurs d'Angleterre que les mots '*peu ou prou*', '*tout de go*', '*endosmose*', '*ankylose*', comme l'expression '*passer outre*' n'exigent pas un savoir '*étendu*' de la langue française, et se trouvent au besoin dans tous les dictionnaires?

Nous vous serions reconnaissants, Monsieur le Directeur, — mon éditeur et moi-même, — de bien vouloir permettre à vos abonnés de faire état s'ils le jugent utile, de ces quelques observations, comptant selon l'usage, sur votre bienveillante équité.

Avec mes plus dévoués hommages.

Paris. CH. PICARD.

## SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS

(A reference to *C.R.* denotes a notice already published in the *Classical Review*.)

### GNOMON.

#### XII. II. NOVEMBER, 1936.

1. R. Hennig: *Die Geographie des homerischen Epos* [*C.R.* XLIX. 60]; 2. F. Ott: *Korfu ist nicht Ithaka* [Würzburg: Tritsch, 1934. Pp. 29, 1 map] (Schuchhardt). 1. Learned and useful. 2. O. attacks with some success H.'s association of Ithaca and the land of the Phaeacians with Corfu. A. J. B. Wace: *An approach to Greek Sculpture* [*C.R.* XLIX. 183] (Snijder). Good and fruitful, though some points are disputable. P. N. Ure: *Aryballoi und Figürines from Rhitona in Boeotia* [*C.R.* XLIX. 182] (Kraiker). An indispensable book of reference. B. D. Filow: *Die Grabhügelnekropole von Duvanlij in Südbulgarien* [Sofia: Staatsdruckerei, 1934. Pp. 244, 16 plates, 229 illustrations, 4<sup>o</sup>] (Schefold). Raises problems which cannot be solved without further excavations, but admirable as far as it goes. A. Müfö: *Stockwerkbau der Griechen und Römer*

[Berlin: de Gruyter, 1932. Pp. ix+133 4<sup>o</sup>] (Weigand). Recommended as a reference book of use to archaeologists and architects. C. Michalowski: *Les portraits hellénistiques et romains* [Paris: de Boccard, 1932. Pp. ii+66, 44 plates, 44 illustrations, 4<sup>o</sup>] (Lippold). It is to be hoped that the older sculptures found on Delos will soon be published with equal competence. F. E. Brown: *The Regia* [Rome: American Academy, 1935 (Memoirs pp. 67-88, plates 4-8)] (Boëthius). In spite of some faults a welcome contribution to the history of Republican architecture. P. Graindor: *Athènes sous Hadrien* [Le Caire: Boulaç, 1934. Pp. ix+317, 27 illustrations] (Toynbee). A useful mine of information but heavy reading. *Der Obergermanisch-rätische Limes des Römerreiches*, Lief. 52, Strecke 3, Lief. 53, Strecke 4 und 5 [Berlin: Petters, 1935-6] (Gelzer). The high standard is maintained as this great work draws towards its end. Hans-Ulrich von Schoenebeck: *Der Mailänder Sarkophag und seine Nachfolge*

[Rome, Freiburg i.B.: Herder, 1935. Pp. 125] (Kollwitz). This new investigation was needed and is on the whole satisfactory. H. Jonas: *Gnosis und spätantiker Geist*. Part 1: *Die mythologische Gnosis* [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1934. Pp. viii+376] (Nock). J. attempts to make a synthesis, but his meaning is far from plain. There is good in the book, but J. does not supersede earlier authorities. C. Höeg: *La notation ekphonétique* [C.R. XLIX. 207] (Wagner). Painstaking and prudent. M. L. W. Laistner: *A History of the Greek World from 479 to 323 B.C.* [London: Methuen, 1936. Pp. xv+492] (Taeger). Often uncritical and inaccurate. W. Knögel: *Der Peripatetiker Ariston von Keos bei Philodem* [C.R. XLVIII. 183] (Rieth). Highly conjectural. Cicero, *de republica* ed. L. Castiglioni [Turin: Paravia, 1936. Pp. xlviii+236] (Kroll). Cannot be ignored by serious students. Q. Orazio Flacco, *Il libro degli epodi*. col commento di C. Giarratano [C.R. XLIX. 80] (Klingner). Some useful grammatical and linguistic observations. J. P. V. D. Balsdon: *The Emperor Gaius Caligula* [C.R. XLIX. 146] (Ensslin). Has the virtues and faults of apologetic history. 1. Στ. Π. Κυριακίδου: Αἱ ἱστορικαὶ ἀρχαὶ τῆς δημόδου νοεοελληνικῆς ποιήσεως [Salonica, 1934]; 2. Δ. Μ. Σάββου: Ὁ Κύκλωπας τοῦ Εὐριπίδου σὲ δημοτικὸν στίχον [Athens, 1931], Σοφοκλῆς, Ἀντιγόνη σὲ δημοτικὸν στίχον [Athens, 1932]; 3. Μ. Ο. Μέρλις: Τραγῳδία τῆς Πουμῆλης [Athens, 1931] (Schwyzer).

## XII. 12. DECEMBER, 1936.

Erasmus, *Ausgewählte Werke* ed. H. Holborn [Munich: Beck, 1933. Pp. xix+329] (Pfeiffer). There is so much misleading literature about Erasmus that a book which brings readers back to the originals is very welcome. O. Regenbogen: *Lukres* [C.R. XLVI. 223] (Büchner). A new approach to Lucretius, which, however unsound, at least rekindles love for the poet. G. Bloch et J. Carcopino: *Histoire romaine*. Tome 2: *La république romaine de 133 à 44 avant J.-C. Des Gracques à Sulla*. J. Carcopino: *César* [C.R. L. 135] (Münzer). The general conception is good, though the space is not always well allotted and there are many misprints and minor mistakes. H. Stubbe: *Die Verseinslagen im Petron* [C.R. XLVII. 245] (Heraeus). Good work and worth continuing. J. Sundwall: *Die Zusammensetzung des Markus-evangeliums* [Åbo Akademi, 1934. Pp. 86] (Bornkamm). Minor objections do not alter the fact that S. has made an important contribution to the study of the Synoptic tradition. E. Diehl: *Zu den neuen Acta Iudorum saecularium septimorum des Jahres 204 n. Chr.* [SBBerl. Phil.-hist. Kl. 1932, 27. Pp. 32]; J. Gagé: *Recherches sur les jeux séculaires* [C.R. XLVIII. 198] (Weinstock). D.'s attempts to restore the text of the new fragments call for admiration. G.'s book, though disproportionate, gives a favourable impression. F. H. Wogensinger: *Theseus* [Diss. Zürich, 1935. Pp. 53] (Herter). Very hypothetical, though some points are worth consideration. *Die Vorsokratiker*. Die Fragmente und Quellenberichte übersetzt und eingeleitet von W. Capelle [Leip-

zig: Kröner, 1935. Pp. xx+502] (Langerbeck). C. attempts a hopeless task. *Die antiken Sprach- und Stiltheorien* [Moscow-Leningrad, 1936. Pp. 341] (Diehl). Stimulating essays in Russian by twelve Russian scholars. L. Amundsen: 1. *Ostraca Osloensia* [Oslo: Dybwad, 1933. Pp. iv+88, 4 plates]; 2. *Greek Ostraca in the University of Michigan Collection*. Part 1: *Texts* [C.R. XLIX. 228] (Zucker). 1 is noteworthy for a very valuable commentary. *Études de papyrologie III* [C.R. L. 202] (Schubart). Mostly Greek literary papyri from the Strasbourg collection edited by N. Lewis, whose work does not inspire confidence.—Bibliographical Supplement 1936 Nr 6 (down to November 30)—Index to Vol. XII.

## PHILOLOGISCHE WOCHENSCHRIFT.

(AUGUST—NOVEMBER, 1936.)

GREEK LITERATURE.—*Plutarchi Vitae Parallelae, Vol. II, fasc. II*. Rec. C. Lindskog et K. Ziegler [C.R. L. 127] (J. Schönemann). Taken all in all this edition is an important achievement.—*Plotini Schriften, Band II: Die Schriften 22-29 der chronologischen Reihenfolge*. Übersetzt von R. Harder [Leipzig, 1936, Meiner. Pp. 207] (Wilh. Nestle). Distinguished by the same excellent features that won praise for the first volume six years ago. But reviewer misses the promised commentary.—*Scholia in Apollonium Rhodium vetera*. Rec. C. Wendel [C.R. L. 36] (P. E. Sonnenburg). Exemplary edition; highly praised.—H. van der Valk, *Beiträge zur Nekyia* [C.R. L. 146] (S. Lorenz). Reviewer agrees in part, but finds V. lacking in feeling for the poetry of the Homeric epics.

LATIN LITERATURE.—X. F. M. G. Wolters, *Notes on antique folk-lore on the basis of Pliny's Natural History, Bk. XXVIII, 22-29* [C.R. L. 42] (H. Lamer). Exemplary both in object and in method. But reviewer criticizes many details.—T. Wikström, *In Firmicum Maternum studia critica* [C.R. L. 89] (K. Ziegler). Conscientious and well-considered work. Deals fully with over 100 passages. Reviewer in detailed discussion accepts some, rejects others, and leaves many doubtful.—G. D. Hadzits, *Lucretius and his influence* [C.R. L. 37] (A. Gudeman). Embodies to a large extent the results of H.'s own research. This and the perfection of style make it equally attractive and instructive.—O. Seel, *Hirtius* [C.R. L. 133] (A. Klotz). Sweeps away some modern cobwebs and helps to a better understanding of the writings under discussion.—H. L. Levy, *The invective 'in Rufinum' of Claudius Claudianus* [C.R. L. 228] (R. Helm). Careful and considered edition. The comprehensive and helpful introduction has to serve in place of a commentary.—P. W. Harsh, *Studies in dramatic 'preparation' in Roman comedy* [C.R. L. 238] (A. Klotz). Complete collection of examples; but H. might have elaborated the art of each poet more distinctly, though he makes valuable suggestions.

HISTORY.—H. H. Scullard, *A history of the Roman world from 753 to 146 B.C.* [C.R. L. 78] (F. Taeger). Extremely useful survey for

which reviewer expresses gratitude.—G. Niccolini, *I Fasti dei Tribuni della Plebe* [C.R. XLIX, 145] (F. Geyer). Presents all the tribunes from 493 B.C. to Theodosius. Valuable aid to historical work.—J. Vogt, *Ciceros Glaube an Rom*. Würzburger Studien, Heft 6 [Stuttgart, 1935. Pp. 101] (A. Klotz). Reviewer summarizes V.'s account of Cicero's belief in Rome and her mission. Enriches our interpretation both of Cicero and of the Ciceronian age.—K. Hanell, *Megarische Studien* [C.R. XLIX, 76] (T. Lenschau). Collects together a number of papers on Megara and her colonies. Very rich in content.—H. M. D. Parker, *A history of the Roman world from A.D. 138 to 337* [C.R. L, 194] (E. Hohl). Skilful and well-informed account. The sections on the army are particularly successful.—R. Hennig, *Terrae incognitae. Eine Zusammenstellung und kritische Bewertung der wichtigsten vorkolumbischen Entdeckungsreisen an Hand der darüber vorliegenden Originalberichte. — Altertum bis Ptolemäus* [Leiden, 1936, Brill. Pp. x+384, and 7 illustrations] (E. Gerster). Records over 65 expeditions. Most important sources are translated into German and then fully discussed. Displays many-sided knowledge which few could equal. Reviewer discusses a few points.—M. L. W. Laistner, *A history of the Greek world from 479 to 323 B.C.* [London, 1936, Methuen. Pp. xv+492] (T. Lenschau). Ranks with Cary's volume on Hellenism and deserves recognition.—E. Kornemann, *Die Alexander-geschichte des Königs Ptolemäus I von Ägypten* [C.R. L, 137] (H. Volkmann). The merit of the book is that it urgently directs attention to a central problem of the Alexander tradition.—K. Bilz, *Die Politik des P. Cornelius Scipio Aemilianus*. Würzburger Studien, Heft 7 [Stuttgart, 1936] (E. Lincke). Excellent work that does justice in every respect to Scipio's

attractive personality. Reviewer expresses different views on some points.—A. C. Johnson, *Roman Egypt* [C.R. L, 195] (T. Lenschau). Contains a wealth of material; might well serve as an introduction to papyrology. Sure of an honourable place in historical study.

PHILOSOPHY.—W. Capelle, *Die Vorsokratiker. Die Fragmente und Quellenberichte übersetzt und eingeleitet* [Leipzig, 1935, Kröner. Pp. xx+502] (Wilh. Nestle). Fulfills the requirements of modern research and will prove very serviceable.—R. Mondolfo, *L'infinito nel pensiero dei Greci* [C.R. XLIX, 153] (Wilh. Nestle). Successfully shows that the idea of infinity was not foreign to Greek thought.

LANGUAGE.—E. Löfstedt, *Syntactica 1. II* [C.R. XLIII, 149 and XLIX, 144] (J. Köhm). Reviewer gives detailed summary of contents and hopes there will be many devoted readers of this excellent work.—J. Marouzeau, *Traité de stylistique appliquée au Latin* [C.R. L, 70] (A. Klotz). Fine work on style by one who really knows Latin. Reviewer wishes it many readers.

COMMUNICATIONS.—22 Aug., P. Keseling, *Xenophons Anabasis in Livius' Buch XXI?* (1½ cols.); J. Jüthner, *Zu Vergils vierter Ekloge* (1½ cols.). 29 Aug., P. Thielscher, *Über die Noctes Gothanae des Justinus Vierschrot* (1½ cols.). 5 Sept., W. Kaspers, *Zum Streit um den Namen 'Germanen'* (2½ cols.). 19 and 26 Sept., O. Wagner, *Textkritisches zu Cornelius Nepos* (6 cols.). 3 Oct., R. G. Bury, *Zu Platon* (15 lines); W. Voigt, *Ἀσπαρούχ* (1½ cols.). 17 Oct., W. Beschewliew, *Zu Herondas Mim. I, 8* (½ col.); K. Westerwick, *Zur Epistel des Horaz an Bullatius* (Ep. I, 11) (1 col.). 24 Oct., A. Vegezi, *Cicerone, fr. 17 Morel* (½ col.). 31 Oct., W. Schmid, *Zur Hypothesis von Euripides' Phoenissen* (1 col.). M. Niedermann, *Petroniana* (3 cols.).

## BOOKS RECEIVED

All publications which have a bearing on classical studies will be entered in this list if they are sent for review. The price should in all cases be stated.

\*.\* Excerpts or extracts from periodicals and collections will not be included unless they are also published separately.

**Bains** (D.). A Supplement to Notae Latinae (Abbreviations in Latin MSS. of 850-1050 A.D.) With a Foreword by W. M. Lindsay. Pp. xiv+72. Cambridge: University Press, 1936. Cloth, 6s.

**Bernhard** (M. L.). Wazy greckie w Muzeum Im. E. Majewskiego w Warszawie. Pp. viii+79; 15 plates. Warsaw: Trzaska, Evert i Michalski, 1936. Paper.

**Bondesson** (B.). De sonis et formis titulorum Milesiorum Didymaeorumque. Pp. xxiii+224. Lund: printed by H. Ohlsson, 1936. Paper.

**Brun** (V.). Alcibiades forsaken by Gods and Men. Translated from the German by C. Ehrenstein and J. Dorman. Pp. ix+373; frontispiece and map. London: Putnam, 1936. Cloth, 7s. 6d.

**Cassaniga** (A.). Elementi retorici nella composizione delle Lettere dal Ponto di Ovidio.

Pp. xii+136. Varese: Seminario Arcivescovile Venegono, 1937. Paper, L. 30.

**Charlesworth** (M. P.). Five men. Character studies from the Roman Empire. Pp. ix+170. (Martin Classical Lectures, Vol. VI.) Cambridge, U.S.A.: Harvard University Press (London: Milford), 1936. Cloth, \$2 or 8s. 6d.

**Classical Association of Scotland**. Proceedings, 1931-1935. Pp. 122. Edinburgh: Pillans and Wilson, 1936. Paper.

**Collingwood** (R. G.) and **Myres** (J. N. L.). Roman Britain and the English Settlements. (The Oxford History of England.) Pp. xxvi+515; 10 maps. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1936. Cloth, 12s. 6d.

**Commentationes Vindobonenses**. II. Jahrgang. Pp. 112. Vienna and Leipzig: Rohrer, 1936. Paper, RM. 2.50.

**Constans** (L.-A.). Cicéron, Correspondance.

Tom  
tion  
'Les  
Corpu  
Gale  
III  
lin:  
RM  
Corpu  
orun  
copi  
cum  
Vien  
Akai  
Pape  
Corpu  
Cam  
Lam  
ford  
Curw  
Pp.  
tions  
don  
Delatte  
cérér  
cuil  
Pp.  
Paris  
pape  
Dodas  
Gree  
Pres  
Fabre  
étab  
Pp.  
III)  
Univ  
Lett  
Fowler  
volun  
491-  
Hein  
12s.  
Galbra  
1406-  
Pp.  
don  
Hadas  
Eurip  
Hippi  
Wom  
Taur  
Done  
York  
Harmo  
transl  
537-  
Hein  
12s.  
Hatzfel  
I (Li  
(Colle  
'Les  
Hesper  
Classi  
Pp. 2  
Amer  
Pape  
Hett (W  
I-XX



- Tome III. Texte établi et traduit. (Collection des Universités de France.) Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres', 1936. Paper, 30 fr.
- Corpus Medicorum Graecorum.* V 10, 2. 1. Galeni in Hippocratis Epidemiarum librum III edidit E. Wenkebach. Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner, 1936. Export prices: paper, RM. 10.20; bound, 15.60.
- Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum.* Vol. LXVIII. S. Gaudentii Episcopi Brixiensis Tractatus. Ad fidem codicum recensuit A. Glueck. Pp. xlvii+275. Vienna: Hölder-Pichler-Tempsky (Leipzig: Akademische Verlagsgesellschaft), 1936. Paper, RM. 20.
- Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum.* Great Britain: Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum. By W. Lamb. Pp. 72; 48 plates. London: Milford, 1936. Cloth and boards, 18s.
- Curwen* (E. C.) The Archaeology of Sussex. Pp. xviii+338; 32 plates, 89 text illustrations. (The County Archaeologies.) London: Methuen, 1937. Cloth, 12s. 6d.
- Delatte* (A.) Herbarius. Recherches sur le cérémonial usité chez les anciens pour la cueillette des simples et des plantes magiques. Pp. 126. (Collection d'Études Anciennes.) Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres', 1936. Stiff paper.
- Dodds* (E. R.) Humanism and Technique in Greek Studies. Pp. 17. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1936. Paper. 1s. 6d.
- Fabre* (P.) César. Guerre civile. Texte établi et traduit. Tome I (Livres I et II). Pp. lxiii+216; 2 maps. Tome II (Livre III). Pp. 247; 5 maps. (Collection des Universités de France.) Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres', 1936. Paper, 20 fr. each.
- Fowler* (H. N.) Plutarch's Moralia. In 14 volumes. Vol. X: 771E-854D. Pp. xii+491. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann, 1936. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.).
- Galbraith* (V. H.) The St. Albans Chronicle, 1406-1420. Edited from Bodley MS. 462. Pp. lxxv+164; 4 plates. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1937. Cloth, 21s.
- Hadas* (M.) and *McLean* (J. H.) The Plays of Euripides. Including: Alcestis, Medea, Hippolytus, Andromache, Ion, Trojan Women, Electra, Iphigenia among the Taurians, The Bacchantes, Iphigenia at Aulis. Done into English. Pp. xvi+499. New York: Dial Press, 1936. Cloth, \$2.75.
- Harmon* (A. M.) Lucian. With an English translation. In 8 volumes. Vol. V. Pp. vii+537. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann, 1936. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.).
- Hatzfeld* (J.) Xénophon. Helléniques. Tome I (Livres I-III). Texte établi et traduit. (Collection des Universités de France.) Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres', 1936. Paper, 25 fr.
- Hesperia.* Journal of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens. Vol. V: No. 3. Pp. 285-441; figures and plates. Athens: American School of Classical Studies, 1936. Paper.
- Hett* (W. S.) Aristotle. Problems. I. Books I-XXI. Pp. x+461. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann, 1936. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.).
- Highby* (L. I.) The Erythrae Decree. Contributions to the early history of the Delian League and the Peloponnesian Confederacy. Pp. viii+108. (Klio, N.F., 23. Beiheft.) Leipzig: Dieterich, 1936. Paper, M. 6.50 (bound, 8).
- Hofmann* (J. B.) Lateinische Umgangssprache. Zweite, durch Nachträge vermehrte Auflage. Pp. xvi+214. Heidelberg: Winter, 1936. Paper, RM. 4.50 (bound, 6); the Nachträge alone, 1.
- Holm* (C. E.) Griechisch-ägyptische Namenstudien. Pp. xii+169; 1 plate. Göteborg: Wettergren och Kerber, 1936. Paper, kr. 6.50.
- Humbert* (J.) Homère. Hymnes. Texte établi et traduit. (Collection des Universités de France.) Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres', 1936. Paper, 30 fr.
- Junel* (B.) In Cassium Felicem Studia. (Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift 1936: 6.) Pp. xv+156. Uppsala: Lundequist, 1936. Paper, 5 kr.
- Kenneth Robert's Book of Gothic Rhapsodies.* I and II. Pp. 35. Chicago: Cloister Press, 1936. Cloth, 75 cents or 3s. postpaid.
- Kienle* (E.) Der Lobpreis von Städten und Ländern in der älteren griechischen Dichtung. Pp. 107. Kallmünz: printed by M. Lassleben, 1936. Paper.
- Korfmacher* (W. C.) Othloni Libellus Proverbiorum. Recensuit adnotationibusque criticis et illustrativis indice nominum et rerum instruxit G.C.K. Pp. xlii+132. Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1936. Paper, \$2.
- Kornhardt* (H.) Exemplum. Eine bedeutungsgeschichtliche Studie. Pp. 97. Borna-Leipzig: printed by R. Noske, 1936. Paper.
- Köstermann* (E.) P. Cornelii Taciti libri qui supersunt. Recognovit C. Halm. Post G. Andresen denuo curavit E. K. Tom. I fasc. II: Libri Ab Excessu Divi Augusti XI-XVI; pp. 199-382. Tom. II fasc. II: Germania, Agricola, Dialogus; pp. 221-324. Tom. I praefatio et index historicus; pp. 53. Tom. II ind. hist.; pp. 80. (Bibl. Scr. Gr. et Rom. Teubn.) Leipzig: Teubner, 1936. Export prices: (cloth) RM. 1.50, 1.20, (paper) .45, .60.
- Lake* (K. and S.) Dated Greek Minuscule Manuscripts to the Year 1200. VI. Manuscripts in Moscow and Leningrad. Plates 374-452, with letterpress, in a portfolio of cloth and boards. Boston: American Academy of Arts and Sciences (London: Christophers), 1936. 42s.
- Legrand* (Ph.-E.) Hérodote. Histoires, Livre II, Euterpe: Texte établi et traduit. Pp. 323. (Collection des Universités de France.) Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres', 1936. Paper, 30 francs.
- Lewis* (L. W. P.) and *Styler* (L. M.) A Book of Latin Translation. Pp. vii+239. London: Heinemann, 1937. Cloth, 3s.
- Lösch* (S.) Diatagma Kaisaros. Die Inschrift von Nazareth und das Neue Testament. Eine Untersuchung zur neutesta-



- mentlichen Zeitgeschichte. Mit 1 Bild der Inschrift. Pp. xiii+100. Freiburg i. B.: Herder, 1936. Paper.
- Moeller** (H.) Untersuchungen zum 'Desmoten' des Aischylos. Pp. 72. Greifswald: printed by H. Adler, 1936. Paper.
- Murray** (A. T.) Demosthenes. Private Orations. With an English translation. In 3 volumes. I. Pp. xi+523. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann, 1936. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.).
- Norvin** (W.) Olympiodori Philosophi in Platonis Gorgiam Commentaria. Edidit W. N. Pp. ii+250. (Bibl. Scr. Gr. et. Rom. Teubn.) Leipzig: Teubner, 1936. Export prices: paper, RM. 9.60; bound, 10.50.
- Opheim** (C.) The Aristaeus Episode of Vergil's Fourth *Georgic*. Pp. 49. (Iowa Studies in Classical Philology, No. IV.) 1936. Copies from the author at Jackson, Minn. Paper, \$7.5.
- Palata** (F.) Anthologia Poeseos Bohemicae Latinis numeris aptata. Appendix: alienigenarum poetarum carmina Latine reddita. Pp. 115. Třebíč (Moravia): Lorenz, 1936. Paper, 24 Kč.
- Papastavru** (J.) Amphipolis: Geschichte und Prosopographie. Pp. xi+152; 3 plates. (Klio, N.F., 24. Beiheft.) Leipzig: Dieterich, 1936. Paper, M. 7.50 (bound, 8.65).
- Papyri Osloenses**. Fasc. III. Edited by S. Eitrem and L. Amundsen. Pp. xi+326, and (in a separate cover) 12 plates. Oslo: Dybwad, 1936. Paper.
- Perry** (B. E.) Studies in the Text History of the Life and Fables of Aesop. Pp. xvi+240; 6 plates. (Philological Monographs published by the American Philological Association, No. VII.) Lancaster, Pa.: Lancaster Press (Oxford: Blackwell), 1936.
- Pohlentz** (M.) Herodot, der erste Geschichtschreiber des Abendlandes. Pp. 222. (Neue Wege zur Antike, II. Reihe, Heft 7/8.) Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner, 1937. Paper, (export price) RM. 6.90.
- Powell** (J. E.) The Rendel Harris Papyri of Woodbrooke College, Birmingham. Edited with Translation and Notes. Pp. xii+134; portrait and 5 plates. Cambridge: University Press, 1936. Cloth and boards, 15s.
- Pym** (D.) Salve per saecula. Latin poetry and prose for the second and third years. Pp. 109; 8 illustrations. London: Harrap, 1936. Cloth, 2s.
- Rütten** (F.) Die Victorverehrung im christlichen Altertum. Eine kulturgeschichtliche und hagiographische Studie. Pp. 182. (Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Altertums, XX. Band, 1. Heft.) Paderborn: Schöningh, 1936. Paper, (export price) M. 6.15.
- Sage** (E. T.) Livy. With an English translation. In 13 volumes. XI. Books XXXVIII-XXXIX. Pp. xiii+412; 4 maps. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann, 1936. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.).
- Schulz** (F.) Principles of Roman Law. Translated, from a text revised and enlarged by the author, by M. Wolff. Pp. xvi+268. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1936. Cloth, 12s. 6d.
- Simensky** (T.) Gramatica Limbii Grecești. Partea I-a: Fonetica și Morfologia. Pp. 205. Bucharest: 'Cartea Românească', 1935. Paper, Lei 200.
- Smedley** (I. F.) Greek and Latin Compositions. Pp. xi+116. Cambridge: University Press, 1936. Cloth, 5s.
- Spadaccini** (R.) Una vittima minore dell'eruzione Vesuviana del 79 D.C.: *Retina*. Pp. 24. Naples, 1936. Paper.
- Stanford** (W. B.) Greek Metaphor. Studies in Theory and Practice. Pp. x+156. Oxford: Blackwell, 1936. Cloth, 10s. 6d.
- Svennung** (J.) Kleine Beiträge zur lateinischen Lautlehre. Pp. 71. (Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift 1936: 7.) Uppsala: Lundequist. Paper, kr. 2.25.
- Symbolae Osloenses**, Fasc. XV-XVI. Edited by S. Eitrem et E. Skard. Pp. 208. Oslo: Brøgger, 1936. Paper.
- The Catholic University of America Studies in Medieval and Renaissance Latin*, Vol. I, Fasc. II. Maphei Vegii Laudensis De Educatione Liberorum Et Eorum Claris Moribus Libri Sex. A Critical Text of Books IV-VI. By Sister A. S. Sullivan. Pp. xxxii, 129-249. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America, 1936. Paper, \$2.
- The University of Missouri Studies*. Vol. XI, No. 3. Philological Studies in honor of Walter Miller, edited by R. P. Robinson. Pp. 190; portrait. Columbia: University of Missouri, 1936. Paper, \$1.25.
- The Year's Work in Classical Studies 1935-6*. Edited by S. G. Owen. Pp. xi+128. Bristol: Arrowsmith, 1936. Paper, 3s. 6d.
- Thomas Rice Edward Holmes**. 1855-1933. Pp. 24. (From the Proceedings of the British Academy. Vol. XXII.) London: Milford, 1936. Paper, 2s.
- Thompson** (D'A. W.) A Glossary of Greek Birds. A new edition. Pp. viii+342; illustrations. London: Milford, 1936. Cloth, 12s. 6d.
- University of California Publications in Classical Philology*, Vol. XII, No. 2, pp. 27-34: Aristophanes and the Pnyx, by J. T. Allen. Berkeley, Cal.: University of California Press (Cambridge: University Press), 1936. Paper, 1s. 3d.
- Wals** (J.) Der lysianische Epitaphios. Pp. 55. (Philologus, Supplementband XXIX, Heft 4.) Leipzig: Dieterich, 1936. Paper, M. 3.60.
- Warmington** (E. H.) Remains of Old Latin, newly edited and translated. In 3 volumes. II: Livius Andronicus, Naevius, Pacuvius and Accius. Pp. xxviii+674. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann, 1936. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.).
- Whatmough** (J.) The Foundation of Roman Italy. Pp. xix+420; 12 plates, 8 maps, 148 text illustrations. (Handbooks of Archaeology.) London: Methuen, 1937. Cloth, 25s.
- Ziegler** (K.) Plutarchus Vitae Parallelae. Galba et Otho. Recognovit K. Z. Pp. xii+60. (Bibl. Scr. Gr. et Rom. Teubn.) Leipzig: Teubner, 1935. Stiff paper, (export price) RM. 1.80.